



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

12-2015

An Examination of the Relationship Between Athletic Satisfaction and Student Adaptation to College

Brian C. Russell

University of Tennessee - Knoxville, brianrussell@utk.edu

Recommended Citation

Russell, Brian C., "An Examination of the Relationship Between Athletic Satisfaction and Student Adaptation to College." PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2015.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/3605

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Brian C. Russell entitled "An Examination of the Relationship Between Athletic Satisfaction and Student Adaptation to College." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Kinesiology and Sport Studies.

James H. Bemiller, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Don Bruce, Lars Dzikus, Bob Rider

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

An Examination of the Relationship Between Athletic Satisfaction and
Student Adaptation to College

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Brian C. Russell
December 2015

Copyright © 2015 by Brian C. Russell
All rights reserved.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, a thank you goes to my incredible wife, Jenna. Your support in my finishing this dissertation has been unwavering, and I truly could not have done it without your sacrifice, commitment, and love through the entire process. You are an amazing person, wife, and mother, and I thank you and Benjamin for supporting me through the finish line. I love you both so very much! To my parents, Rose and Paul, and my brother and sister-in-law, Dr. Scott and Carol Russell, thank you for instilling in me a passion for education and for being wonderful examples to get the most out of this life we are given. Since the moment of my adoption, I have undoubtedly won the lottery of life. I love you all!

I was lucky to have a wonderful and patient committee throughout this process, and I owe an enormous thank you to two of my original committee members: Drs. Joy DeSensi and Dulcie Peccolo. Dulcie, thank you for being my first professional mentor and for taking a chance on me after graduate school. I will never be able to show proper gratitude for all that I learned in my years working with you and will certainly never be able to thank you enough for encouraging me to travel the doctoral journey. Dr. DeSensi, thank you for piquing my interest in research in this area and for being an unbelievable example of how to truly care for and love working with students. I sincerely appreciate you for getting me started on this process and in this field.

To my chair, Jim Bemiller, JD., and current committee members, Drs. Don Bruce, Lars Dzikus, and Bob Rider, thank you for sticking with me and motivating me through the last couple of years. Jim, thank you for taking me on as your first doctoral student, as I have no doubt it was not always easy chairing this process. You always had my back and I could not have done it without you! Don, thanks for being a great daily motivator and for taking the time to continually challenge and support me in finishing. The time you dedicated to me down the stretch can never be repaid, and I sincerely appreciate your mentorship! Lars, along with Dr. DeSensi, your passion for working with and teaching students is what initially drew me into the area of socio-cultural studies in sport. The courses you taught were a couple of the toughest courses in my entire academic career from the undergraduate through doctoral level; however, the amount I learned from those courses can never be explained. Your passion for teaching and working with students is something that I will always carry with me in the student-services field, and your undying support for human rights in sport will always remain an underlying theme of my daily work with students. Bob, as my original Dean and an original committee member, thank you for always being in my corner. Whether in a work setting, in an academic setting, or on the golf course, your ability to connect with people is remarkable, and your leadership is a roadmap for any individual hoping to become a successful Dean. The picture in my mind of shaking your hand as I walk across the stage as a two-time graduate of your college has been a motivating factor for me through this entire process. Thank you for always fighting for your students.

A special thanks to the entire Thornton staff for supporting me to finish and especially to the football crew (Greig Cryer, Lynsey Miller, and Marshall Steward) for having my back and picking up my slack while I focused on completing this dissertation.

Dr. Georgia Caver, thank you for serving as my editor and for your continual reminders that the end was in sight. Donna Thomas, thank you for giving me my first opportunity to work directly with our student-athletes and for mentoring me in the athletics world. Dr. Joe Scogin, thank you for believing in me personally and professionally, and for pushing me and allowing me to make time to finish this degree. Your leadership and support on a daily basis is something that I will cherish and continue to learn from, and I cannot thank you enough for the impact you have had on me in all phases of this professional and academic life. Thank you!!

Abstract

Research on the experience of student-athletes at the collegiate level suggests that they may face challenges and hurdles in adjusting to college differently than those faced by students of the general student population. Additionally, research on student satisfaction suggests that a student's satisfaction has an impact on the academic experience and retention of students, while research on athletic satisfaction suggests a relationship exists between athletic and academic satisfaction for student-athletes. However, it remains unclear whether there is a positive or negative relationship between the experiences of adjustment to college and athletic satisfaction of a student-athlete.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between various facets of athletic satisfaction and specific areas of adjustment from high school to college for Division 1A intercollegiate athletes in order to bring a broader perspective of understanding to the holistic experience of first-year student-athletes. In a quantitative research tradition using a correlative research design, the researcher examines the concepts using the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) and the Athletic Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) in surveying first-year student-athletes ($n = 76$) at an NCAA Division I FBS institution.

Based on the findings of this research, it is reasonable to conclude that for the first-year student-athletes in this study, a positive relationship exists between athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college. For both academic and athletic administrators, the findings suggest that the experience of a student-athlete should not be compartmentalized and that the academic, athletic, and social experiences of a student-athlete are

interconnected. Additionally, in examining specific subgroups of student-athletes by gender, ethnicity, type of sport (revenue vs. non-revenue) and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship), the findings indicate that the subgroups experienced the relationship between athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college differently. Furthermore, the major takeaway for academic support services personnel is that regardless of the specific subgroup of student-athletes, satisfaction with academic support services is unequivocally the highest area of positive correlation with a student-athlete's adjustment to college.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction and General Information.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study	7
Organization of the Study	13
Definition of Key Terminology	14
Chapter 2 Literature Review	19
Introduction.....	19
Research and Literature on Adjustment to College	28
Research and Literature on Student-Athlete Adjustment to College.....	34
Research and Literature on Athlete Satisfaction.....	42
Chapter 3 Methods	47
Introduction and Research Questions	47
Research Design, Site and Population	48
Instrumentation	49
Procedures.....	55
Data Analysis	56
Chapter 4 Results	59
Demographic Information.....	59
Results from Research Question 1	59
Results from Research Question 2.....	60
Results from Research Question 3.....	62
Results from Research Question 4.....	64
Results from Research Question 5.....	64
Results from Research Question 6.....	69
Chapter 5 Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	75
List of References	86
Appendices.....	100
Vita.....	107

List of Tables

Table 1. Description of ASQ Subscales.....	10
Table 2. Description of SACQ Subscales	11
Table 3. Correlations of Total ASQ and Total SACQ by Subgroup	60
Table 4. Correlations of Total ASQ and SACQ Subscales.....	63
Table 5. Correlations of Total SACQ and ASQ Subscales.....	65
Table 6.1. Correlations of Research Question 3 by Gender	65
Table 6.2. Correlations of Research Question 3 by Ethnicity.....	66
Table 6.3. Correlations of Research Question 3 by Revenue	66
Table 6.4. Correlations of Research Question 3 by Athletic Aid	66
Table 7.1. Correlations of Research Question 4 by Gender	70
Table 7.2. Correlations of Research Question 4 by Ethnicity.....	71
Table 7.3. Correlations of Research Question 4 by Revenue	72
Table 7.4. Correlations of Research Question 4 by Athletic Aid	73

Chapter 1

Introduction and General Information

Introduction

As yet another university, this time the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill reels from the public shame and humiliation from a major academic scandal within athletics (Stripling, 2014), one has to wonder how something that began as a small boat race between Harvard and Yale has turned into the current world of college athletics within higher education. How did college sports reach a point where the pressure to succeed athletically and academically is so great that the educational endeavors of the college experience are often compromised? What do we know about the experiences of the student-athletes as they balance the demands of being a student and athlete in this environment?

Within the current landscape of college athletics, the academic successes and holistic development of student-athletes should be at the forefront of the conversation surrounding the sporting experience. This conversation requires a university and athletics department to look beyond the records of wins and losses to examine a more comprehensive view of the student-athlete experience in all facets of a student-athlete's life, including educational, sport, non-sport, and social experiences.

Athletics departments and universities are realizing this need to be true as the dedication of both financial and human resources to support the well-being of student-athletes has been prioritized in the past few years. Currently, athletics departments and universities across the nation offer services, including direct academic support from

tutorial programs and learning specialists, academic guidance from academic counselors, nutritional support from professional dieticians, psychological support for in-sport and out-of-sport mental issues from both clinical and sports psychologists, and career development support from professionals trained in the field to support student-athletes. In its entirety, the purpose of all of these services for student-athletes is an attempt to fully support a student-athlete's satisfaction in all areas of the collegiate sporting experience.

Understanding student-athlete satisfaction is of critical importance to the effective athletic organization, as meeting the needs of its student-athletes, the organization's primary constituents and producers of entertainment, is one of the main purposes for collegiate athletics (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). Coupled with exploring how the adjustment to college affects student-athletes, examining a student-athlete's levels of satisfaction with his or her athletic experience may lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the total student-athlete transition-to-college process. Student-athlete satisfaction is a complex but important issue to attempt to understand.

In order for a student to have a successful college experience, it is imperative that the transition from high school to college is given appropriate attention during the first year. As Tinto (1993) wrote, "The first year proves to be an especially important year in the process of persistence. The experience that year does much to shape subsequent persistence. By the same token, the largest proportion of institutional leaving occurs in that year" (p. 14).

Student-athletes are faced with a complex position on college campuses because their participation in college athletics adds an intense layer to their college experiences. They have adjustments to college similar to those of non-athletes, dealing with issues of intellectual growth, social activities, and commitment to their academic studies, but they also have stressful and time consuming sports-related obligations in terms of attending practice, seeing trainers, managing travel demands, studying playbooks, competing on game days, and facing stereotyping and discrimination on campus and in the classroom (Watt & Moore, 2001; Sedlacek, 1992).

College and university athletics play a continually developing and impactful role in our society's hunger for sporting events, and student-athletes continue to face more pressure and demands than ever before. College sport is truly commercialized, and student-athletes and their adjustments to college may become difficult to balance in the web of commercialization. Clotfelter (2013) wrote, "In no other large country in the world is commercialized athletic competition so closely tied to institutions of higher education" (p. 6). He later continued (2013):

Only in the United States has there grown up such an elaborate system of publicized and commercialized sports contests involving university-sponsored teams. Although most of the teams sponsored by the 4,000 colleges and universities in the United States are no more famous or commercial than university teams in other countries, the football and basketball teams representing several hundred universities achieve such high levels of revenue and visibility that

their universities in effect become part of the American entertainment industry.

(p. 6)

Sitting directly in the middle of this juxtaposition of the commercialization of sport and the educational mission of universities is the life of the student-athlete. Often pulled in two different directions, the student-athlete must learn to understand the complexities of his or her athletic world and identity while balancing a student identity.

In summary, due to the current landscape of high-pressure, commercialized college athletics, colleges' and universities' intentional emphasis on retention and graduation, and the unique experience of facing challenges and barriers in adjusting to college as a student-athlete, the student-athlete's experience of athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college is a topic worthy of deeper examination. While there has been separate research on student-athlete satisfaction as it relates to the athletic experience as well as the adjustment process from high school to college for student-athletes, there has been little research on the link between the relationship of the student-athlete's satisfaction with his or her athletic experience and that student-athlete's adjustment to college. This research is needed to better understand the entire collegiate experience of first-year student-athletes.

Statement of the Problem

Research on the experience of the student-athlete at the collegiate level suggests they may face challenges and hurdles in adjusting to college different than those faced by students of the general student population. Additionally, research on student satisfaction suggests that a student's satisfaction has an impact on the academic experience and

retention of students. To this point in time, student-athlete adaptation to college and student-athlete athletic satisfaction have not been examined for linkages between the two concepts with regard to the holistic student-athlete experience. It remains unclear whether there is a positive or negative relationship between the two concepts: adjustment to college and the athletic satisfaction of a student-athlete.

More directly, does a student-athlete's athletic satisfaction correlate with how he or she adjusts to college? Are there specific facets within athletic satisfaction that correlate more than others with how a student-athlete adjusts to college? Or do the concepts of adjusting to college and being satisfied or dissatisfied with the athletic experience have no correlational relationship for a student-athlete? Can the concepts be broken down and treated as separate entities, or do academic and athletic administrators and support personnel need to have an understanding that the athletic and academic experiences of first-year student-athletes are certainly relational? If the concepts are related, are there differences in how the concepts are related in male and female student-athletes, student-athletes of varying ethnicities, student-athletes in different types of sports, and student-athletes' athletic aid status? These questions remain largely unanswered, and this research seeks to bring a broader perspective to the holistic experience of first-year student-athletes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between various facets of athletic satisfaction and specific areas of adjustment from high school to college for Division I intercollegiate athletes.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between student-athletes' satisfaction with their athletic experiences and their adjustments to college?
2. How does the relationship discovered by research question one vary by: gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing vs. non-revenue producing), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship)?
3. How does the relationship discovered by research question one vary by subscale of adjustment in academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution?
4. How does the relationship discovered by research question one vary by subscale of athletic satisfaction in individual performance, team performance, ability utilization, strategy, personal treatment, training and instruction, team task contribution, team social contribution, ethics, team integration, personal dedication, budget, medical personnel, academic support services, and external agents?
5. How does the relationship discovered by research question three vary controlling for differences by: gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing vs. non-revenue producing), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship)?
6. How do the relationships discovered by research question four vary controlling for differences by: gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of

sport (revenue producing vs. non-revenue), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship)?

Significance of the Study

In today's commercialized world of college athletics, the student-athlete is often pulled in many different directions. Administrative decisions that directly affect the student-athlete's life are, often times, made with little to no input from the student-athlete. It is easy, in the current environment, for a student to become simply another cog in the wheel of the athletics system, a pawn or puzzle piece controlled by the authorities in power, while being taken advantage of for his or her athletic talent. If a student-athlete can understand the big picture of his or her holistic experience and development, it is a win-win scenario for both academics and athletics.

Currently, there is not enough information regarding the holistic experience of student-athletes in examining their athletic and academic experiences. There is a wealth of information that can be gained from having a better understanding of what student-athletes experience, and the research opportunities are limitless. By focusing directly on the first-year athletic and academic experience of student-athletes, I hope that the research will provide a foundation for working with student-athletes upon their entry into the university. The reality is that the first-year is, without question, a critical year that has a deep impact on the entire academic and athletic career of a student-athlete (Tinto, 1993). If a successful foundation is established during the first-year, the remaining years can be focused on expanding the experience and getting the most out of college, rather

than the opposite of spending the second and third years digging out of holes and struggling to survive.

As an administrator, I have worked in the general college advising office of two colleges, working with all students of the general student population, and also worked within a student-athlete support services office directly supporting the academic and athletic successes of student-athletes. Therefore, I possess experiences and views not often found in administrators and decision makers regarding policies and procedures affecting student-athletes. In a generalized sense, the view from the academic advising administrator in a college may be that the student-athlete should be able to focus and succeed academically regardless of what might be happening in his or her life athletically. On the other hand, the view from the athletic administrator may be that the student-athlete should be performing well athletically regardless of what may be going on socially and in the classroom.

I have attended many meetings and been involved in many discussions from both the academic and athletic sides of the table, and realized that in many instances, as administrators, we are continually attempting to pull a student-athlete's time in one direction or the other without much thought given to the entire picture of that student-athlete's life. For instance, all in discussing one student-athlete, an athletic trainer may need more of the student-athlete's time to rehabilitate an injury, a strength and conditioning staff member may need more of the student-athlete's time to develop critical strength for competition, a coach may need more of the student-athlete's time to help him or her better understand the scouting report for the upcoming opponent, a media relations

staff member may need more of the student-athlete's time for media interviews, an athletic-academic support professional may need more of the student-athlete's time for the student-athlete to receive extra tutoring for an upcoming exam, and an academic advisor or professor on campus may need more of the student-athlete's time to meet to discuss the student-athlete's academic progress. While this may seem to be a far-reaching scenario, it is not uncommon. Which area of the student-athlete's life gets priority when he or she is getting pulled in this many different directions? Multiple areas obviously have to give in as there is only so much time available in a student-athlete's life. In this example, there is often a lack of understanding of the impact of each of the areas on a student-athlete's life as each administrator believes his or her area to be most important. I do not believe there is a general answer to which area should give in or which area should take precedence, as each student-athlete and each situation is different, but a better understanding of the entire student-athlete experience may help to better facilitate discussions and decisions regarding the lives of student-athletes. If a better understanding is had by all, the connection between academic and athletic administrators becomes more effective.

With specific regard to this study, I examine the holistic experience of student-athletes by using the Athletic Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). The ASQ measures a student's *Overall Satisfaction* with his or her athletic experience as well as fifteen subscales of athletic satisfaction (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002). The description of the fifteen subscales may be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of ASQ Subscales

SUBSCALE OF ASQ	DESCRIPTION OF SUBSCALE
Individual Performance	individual's satisfaction with his or her own task performance including absolute performance, improvements in performance, and goal achievement
Team Performance	individual's satisfaction with his or her team's level of performance
Ability/Utilization	satisfaction with how the coach uses and/or maximizes the individual athlete's talents and or/abilities
Strategy	satisfaction with strategic and tactical decisions made by the coach
Personal Treatment	satisfaction with coaching behaviors including social support and positive feedback that directly affect the individual, yet indirectly affect team development
Training and Instruction	satisfaction with training and instruction provided by the coach
Team Task Contribution	satisfaction with actions by which the group serves as a substitute for leadership for the athlete
Team Social Contribution	satisfaction with how teammates contribute to the athlete as a person
Ethics	satisfaction with ethical positions of teammates
Team Integration	satisfaction with members' contributions and coordination of their efforts toward the team's task
Personal Dedication	satisfaction with his or her own contribution to the team
Budget	satisfaction with the amount of money provided to the team by the athletic department
Medical Personnel	satisfaction with the team's medical personnel
Academic Support Services	satisfaction with the academic support services provided to the athletes
External Agents	satisfaction with those elements outside the organization that may contribute to the team

The Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) measures a student's *Total Adjustment to College* as well as four subscales of adjustment to college (Baker & Siryk, 1999). The description of the four subscales may be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Description of SACQ Subscales

SUBSCALE OF SACQ	DESCRIPTION OF SUBSCALE
Academic Adjustment	measure of adjustment to the various academic demands typical of the college experience
Social Adjustment	measure of adjustment to the interpersonal demands of college in the social realm
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	measure of adjustment to how the student is experiencing psychological distress and any associated psycho-somatic problems
Attachment to the Institution	measure of adjustment to how bonded the student is to the institution

Having data on whether or not a relationship exists between total athletic satisfaction and total adaptation to college is important in discussions involving the lives of student-athletes. In the most basic sense, the data are needed to be able to make sound decisions regarding the balance and relationship of the academic and athletic experience. For an administrator, operating with this as a guiding principle, it will make a difference in both the athletic and academic worlds to have other administrators consider the viewpoints of all parties involved.

Maintaining the theme of using the overall athletic satisfaction score, it will be interesting to determine if relationships exist between the various areas of adjustment to college. If total athletic satisfaction has a strong direct relationship to attachment to the

institution, the conclusion could be drawn that athletic satisfaction may be a factor in a student-athlete's decision to remain at the institution. In a working sense, an administrator will need to understand that a decision negatively affecting a student-athlete's athletic satisfaction may have a direct impact on that student-athlete's decision to transfer. While an administrator should not base all decisions simply on keeping student-athletes happy, it will be an important point to consider, as a student-athlete transferring out of the institution may have a negative effect on graduation and academic progress rates, which in turn may affect a team's ability to maintain a full load of scholarships and compete in post-season play.

If total athletic satisfaction relates strongly to a student-athlete's academic adjustment, this could be an argument for a coach and athletic administrator to take into account the student-athlete's satisfaction with his or her athletic experiences if the academic success of that student-athlete is important. In the same scenario, it would be highly important for an academic administrator to understand that if asking a student-athlete to sacrifice effort and sport commitment leads to lower athletic satisfaction it may actually have a negative effect on the student-athlete's academic adjustment. It is common practice for an academic administrator to pull a student-athlete away from a sport when the student-athlete is struggling academically; however, what if pulling the student away from his or her sport leads to decreased levels of athletic satisfaction and lower levels of academic adjustment? It certainly throws an additional factor into the discussion regarding best practices in taking away sporting activities of a student-athlete. Conversely, if analyzing the data reveals that there is no relationship between a student-

athlete's total athletic satisfaction and academic adjustment, my hypotheses that there is a connectedness in a student-athlete's experiences may be unsupported.

The translational attributes of this research are abundant and will vary depending on the actual results of the data analysis. In general, administrators, academic support professionals, coaches, and academicians must understand that the student-athlete experience cannot be compartmentalized. If, as professionals, we are compartmentalizing the student-athlete's experiences in decision making and programming, we are ignoring a major component of a student-athlete's holistic experience, and are approaching the equation of student-athlete success the wrong way. To have a data-driven understanding of the relationship between a student-athletes' social, academic and athletic experiences would be ground-breaking in the field of athletic academic support services. It is for these reasons and for the betterment of the student-athlete experience that I am interested in this significant research.

Organization of the Study

The study is presented in five chapters. The first chapter covers the background and rationale for the study, states the problem and purpose of the study, states the research question and identifies the significance of the study. The second chapter provides a critical review of the literature of student adjustment to college, student-athlete-specific adjustment to college, and athlete satisfaction. The third chapter details the methods and procedures that were used to conduct the quantitative study and includes the research design, site and population, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis. The fourth chapter presents the findings to the research questions. The fifth and

final chapter provides an overall summary to the study, including a discussion of the findings, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future study.

Definition of Key Terminology

Ability Utilization (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the type of satisfaction reported with how the coach uses or maximizes the individual athlete's talents or abilities (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Academic and Athletic Balance – The description of a concept of the time and focus devoted to balancing the often conflicting academic and athletic worlds of the student-athlete (Watt & Moore, 2001).

Academic Adjustment – How well a student handles adjusting to the educational demands of the college experience (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Academic Support Services (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the level of satisfaction reported with the academic support services provided to the athlete (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Adjustment/Adaptation – The measure of how well a student meets the demands of transitioning from high school to college (Feldt, Graham & Dew, 2011).

Athletic Boosters/Donors – Alumni, trustees, and fans of an institution's athletic program that support the institution through monetary gifts (Nixon, 2014).

Athletic Identity – Describes the extent to which a student-athlete views him/herself as an athlete as his/her primary role; for instance, a student-athlete with a strong athletic identity may view his/her college experience as revolving around his/her sport rather than academics (Adler & Adler, 1991).

Athletic Scholarship/Aid - Also referred to as “grant-in-aid” and the system in which athletics are provided with grants sufficient to cover the cost of their college education; in return for athletic performance, students are provided with scholarships to cover tuition and fees, room and board, travel, and a monthly stipend (Duderstadt, 2000).

Athletic Trap – The difficult position of a decision maker in weighing educational decisions against athletic decisions with a grand vision that big-time college sports brings glory and success to the entire university, including institutional rewards such as athletic revenue, higher rate of applicants for admissions, increased loyalty from alumni, increased donations from financial backers, a heightened sense of student spirit on campus, and an easier time working with educational lawmakers (Nixon, 2014).

Attachment to the Institution – The measured extent to which a student has a relationship or bond with the institution, which includes a student’s feelings about being in college and the college he/she is attending (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Budget (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the satisfaction reported with the amount of money provided to the team by the athletic department (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Commercialization – As related to college sport – A college’s pursuit of relationships and partnerships with corporations for purposes of financing various aspects of the sporting experience (Nixon, 2014).

Eligibility – The concept of a student maintaining a specified set of standards as enforced by the NCAA in order to compete in his/her collegiate sport (Watt & Moore, 2001).

Ethics (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure an athlete's satisfaction with the ethical positions of teammates (Rierner & Chelladurai, 2002).

Exploitation – “The unfair treatment or use of, or the practice of taking selfish or unfair advantage of, a person or situation, usually for personal gain” (Polite & Hawkins, 2012, p. 2).

External Agents (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure an athlete's satisfaction with the elements outside of the organization which may contribute to the team (Rierner & Chelladurai, 2002).

Individual Performance (Athlete Satisfaction) - The satisfaction subscale used to measure an individual athlete's satisfaction with his or her own task performance (Rierner & Chelladurai, 2002).

Medical Personnel (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure an individual athlete's satisfaction with the medical support personnel of the team (Rierner & Chelladurai, 2002).

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) – The most well-known, oldest, and largest governance organization for collegiate athletics and the organization charged with legislating and enforcing standards for sporting competitions as voted upon and determined by NCAA member institutions (Smith, 2011).

Personal Dedication (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the individual athlete's satisfaction with his or her own contribution to the team (Rierner & Chelladurai, 2002).

Personal-Emotional Adjustment – How well a student handles the psychological and physical aspects of adjustment to college; the level to which a student experiences psychological distress or any physical problems in the adjustment to college (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Personal Treatment (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure an athlete's satisfaction with coaching behaviors that directly affect the individual (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Psychosocial Wellness – A working definition of “positive adaptation” in that *psychosocial* encompasses the importance of both intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning and *wellness* is intended to define the notion of health as a dynamic state or process (Lent, 2004).

Recruit – A high school student who is pursued by college coaches and administrators in an attempt to persuade the student to attend that coach's/administrator's institution for the purpose of playing a sport in college (Duderstadt, 2000).

Retention – The term used to describe a student returning to the same institution for the next chronological year of his/her educational experience; arguably, an institution's top priority to increase graduation rates and enhance the student experience (Tinto, 1993).

Revenue Producing Sport – A sport that has the potential to produce revenue; in the literature, revenue producing sports are football and men's basketball, as they have the greatest potential to produce revenue. At some institutions, women's basketball and hockey may generate money, but in general, no sports other than football and men's basketball make enough money to pay their own expenses (Coakley, 2007).

Social Adjustment – How well a student handles the interpersonal-societal demands in adjustment to college (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Strategy (Athlete Satisfaction) - The satisfaction subscale used to measure the athlete's satisfaction with the strategic decisions made by the coach (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Team Integration (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the athlete's satisfaction with the members' contributions and coordination of their efforts toward the team's task (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Team Performance (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure an individual's satisfaction with the team's level of performance (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Team Social Contribution (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the level of satisfaction with how teammates contribute to the athlete as a person (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Team Task Contribution (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the level of satisfaction with actions by which the group serves as a substitute for leadership for the individual athlete (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Training and Instruction (Athlete Satisfaction) – The satisfaction subscale used to measure the satisfaction with the training and instruction provided by the coach (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between various facets of athletic satisfaction and specific areas of adjustment from high school to college for Division 1A intercollegiate athletes. A review of the research and literature related to the topic is presented in this chapter and is organized by an introduction and followed by discussion of the topics of adjustment to college, student-athlete adjustment to college, and athlete satisfaction.

Introduction

To fully understand the experience of a collegiate student-athlete at the Division I level, it is important to understand a brief history of how the commercialization of college sport developed to shape the current landscape of the student-athlete experience. The origin of collegiate athletics can be traced to a rowing club at Yale University. After ten years of operating as a rowing club, the rowers from Yale met the rowers of Harvard in the first American intercollegiate sporting contest in 1852 in what may have been the most important boat race in the history of higher education. Instead of the race occurring on Harvard's or Yale's campus, a railroad superintendent paid to transport and house the two teams at a vacation spot in New Hampshire; thus, the commercialization of college athletics was born before the first amateur competition could even occur (Smith, 1988; Nixon, 2014).

After the Harvard vs. Yale competition in 1852, athletics certainly had a place within higher education. College administrators learned soon thereafter that news of the

crew races was helping to publicize the colleges and, thus, aided in admissions. College administrators then added baseball as an intercollegiate sport in 1859, and ten years later, in 1869, the first game of intercollegiate football was held between Rutgers and Princeton (Smith, 1988). Especially within big universities, no other sport was received with such enthusiasm, created more controversy, or caused more meetings than football. As more and more colleges played football, it soon became an important part of campus life, but it was still without the official sanction of the athletes' colleges and universities. Students raised the necessary money for participation and travel from loyal alumni and followers. College administrators realized that football increased the prestige of the institution, which in turn led to increased alumni donations and attracted highly sought after prospective students (Chu et al., 1985).

It is important to note that athletics as a collegiate activity was largely student driven, as students were free to develop their own extracurricular activities. However, even at the earliest stages of college athletics, faculty groups at individual colleges wrestled with the positives and negatives of athletics as an extracurricular activity. On one hand, faculty groups believed in the notion that exercise contributed value to students' health; on the other hand, faculty believed uncontrolled athletics led to educational abuses (Smith, 1988). On the positive side, it was argued that participation in athletics supplemented the educational process because lessons that could not be learned from a textbook could be learned on the playing fields. Sports could be used as a "vehicle to instill in participants an appreciation for concepts such as teamwork, discipline, and perseverance, which directly related to the teaching component of higher

education” (Gerdy, 1997, p. 33). This argument was further enhanced by the claim that coaches were teachers and educators and participation in athletics helped build character of those involved. However, many contend that in spite of these claims of educational purpose, athletics’ initial incorporation into higher education had more to do with generating money, visibility, and prestige for the university than anything educationally based. Colleges needed resources of all kinds to enhance their educational missions and a successful sports program had the potential to increase funding for the university as a whole (Gerdy, 1997).

With institutional prestige assuming such a great importance in intercollegiate athletics, by the time of the second meeting of the crew teams of Yale and Harvard in 1855, Yale questioned the eligibility of a Harvard oarsman who had already graduated. However, since there was no governing body at the time, Yale had no authority to which it could appeal (Frey, 1982). This was the first clear form of a need for governance in collegiate athletics. This need only increased by the 1890’s as universities were bound and determined to win at any cost and were committing bigger and bigger excesses to do so. Professional baseball players were becoming campus starters and coaches were inserting non-students for football games on a regular basis. Fans packed the stadiums to root for sports heroes who attended classes only during their season of sport (Chu et al., 1985). At Yale, an investigation of athletics excesses revealed that a secret fund of \$100,000 existed and had been used to tutor athletes, give expensive gifts to athletes, purchase entertainment for coaches, and pay for vacations for athletes (Smith, 2011).

Collegiate sports were at a critical crossroads in 1895, and the first meeting of “The Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives” was called to order. This conference became one of the first to have regulations regarding students’ eligibility and participation (Chu et al., 1985). Rules and regulations were formulated by this committee and were viewed as working well until in 1905, when it was reported, in total, eighteen students had been killed and one-hundred forty-three had been injured playing the game of football. President Roosevelt met with representatives from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton and urged them to do something about the reports, and the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) was formed in 1906 to oversee all sports in order that the athletic activities in the colleges and universities would be maintained on an ethical plane while keeping the purpose of education (Chu et al., 1985).

By 1910, the IAAUS evolved into the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) which is widely known as the oldest and largest governance organization for collegiate athletics. Throughout the early years, the NCAA existed as a discussion group and concerned itself largely with playing rules and championships. It was not until the 1940s that the NCAA’s role in the governance of athletics moved significantly from the areas of discussions, championships, and playing rules to regulatory considerations (Smith, 2011). Guidelines had been established for recruiting and financial aid, but as they became increasingly abused, the need for full-time professional leadership grew. The association’s activities had been directed by its elected volunteer leaders for years, operating from their own institutions and in the 1940s, the Big Ten Conference had provided office services for the association. In 1951, Walter Byers, who had been

handling NCAA affairs on a part-time basis as an executive assistant in the Big Ten office, was named full-time executive director of the NCAA (Smith, 2011). In 1951 and 52, the association's membership adopted a program of controlled live television, delegated prescribed rules-enforcement powers to the NCAA Council, and approved legislation to govern post-season football bowl games. The NCAA's regulatory function, as it is known today, had begun (Smith, 2011).

Understanding how the commercialization and development of college sports and the NCAA has shed light on the fact that there is an inherent challenge in maintaining the purity of amateur competition in collegiate athletics. In fact, researchers argue that in specific regard to the revenue producing sports of men's basketball and football, collegiate athletics is no different than the minor leagues and student-athletes are treated simply as unpaid professional athletes (Clotfelter, 2013; Czopp, 2010; Nixon, 2014).

In his book, *Downstairs, Upstairs: The Changed Spirit and Face of College Life in America*, former faculty member, university administrator, and college president, John Flower wrote that anyone "who has served as a president, provost, or vice president for student affairs on a campus involved in Division I NCAA sports will attest to the merry-go-round created by the sports-addicted public and alumni booster clubs" (Flower, 2003, p. 114). He outlined a few major problems in college athletics including lower graduation rates for student-athletes than their non-athlete peers, lesser classroom expectations for student-athletes from faculty members, lesser standards of professionalism and higher salaries for coaches than their academic administrator peers, and an overall corrupting effect of the large amounts of money involved (Flower, 2003).

Other researchers have noted the increased struggle to maintain a balance between academic standards and a winning athletic program (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Duderstadt, 2003; Estler & Nelson, 2005, Nixon, 2014). As Duderstadt (2003) noted, “The values, goals, and nature of intercollegiate athletics are so totally different from those of academic units that athletic departments generally lie at the periphery of the university” (p. 88). He continued by acknowledging that athletic departments vary so differently from academic departments in thought, as the focus of an athletic department is quite often on producing immediate results without much effort thinking about a long-term goal. These varying viewpoints can create problems in decision making for a university. University presidents often battle the voices of wide variety of stakeholders when making decisions regarding athletics and academics. On one side of the fence, the president must take into account the viewpoints of the faculty, students, and members of governing boards who may view increased commitment to athletics as unnecessary spending and an unfaithfulness to traditional academic values. On the other side, a president who questions the size or role of an athletic program may be forced to deal with anger from the boards, community members, alumni, and students whose commitment and feelings of belonging to the university may be tied to athletic teams and success in athletics (Estler & Nelson, 2005). Unfortunately for the academic side, academic values are increasingly being outweighed by increased mass commercialization of college athletics.

As McAllister (1998) found, athletes and teams as a whole are continually being commodified for the benefit of economics, and decision normally made for educational

purposes are being made for the sake of profit. He noted, “Coaches of big programs may be more pressured to wine and dine, or even lie to, potential recruits more than ever before; they may be more tempted to pressure faculty to pass talented collegiate athletes” (p. 366). Coaches may essentially feel the pressure to play a talented athlete regardless of whether or not the student is in good academic or university standing because of the pressure to win big-money games. In the situation described by this statement, interests of the athletes and educational missions of institutions are coming second to pressure from sponsors and commercialization of big time bowl games. In essence, student-athletes on these teams become victims in a profit-driven system.

Nixon (2014) used the term *athletic trap* to describe the difficult position college presidents find themselves in when balancing decisions of athletic and educational importance. He described the *athletic trap* as a grand vision that big-time college sports would bring glory and success to the entire university, including institutional rewards such as athletic revenue, higher rate of applicants for admissions, increased loyalty from alumni, increased donations from financial backers, a heightened sense of student spirit on campus, and an easier time working with educational lawmakers. Nixon (2014) contended that buying into the *athletic trap* meant “the pressure to win can lead to major compromises of the academic integrity of the institution and result in a ceding of significant control of athletics to athletic departments and coaches or to boosters and interests outside the institution” (p. 9). In this model of the *athletic trap*, administrative decisions may be made for the good of the athletic enterprise without much thought to the educational impacts to the student-athletes involved.

For the student-athletes in the system of commercialized college sport, the argument is that they are “paid” for their athletic services by scholarships that pay part or all of their tuition and living expenses; however, from an economic standpoint, it is easy for student-athletes to be taken advantage of, as the athletic scholarship may not be equivalent to the value they bring to an institution. For a star athlete, the production of athletic success, favorable publicity, revenue, and other rewards for the institution generally far exceeds the value of what the student-athlete receives in compensation of the athletic scholarship (Nixon, 2014).

While a fortunate few student-athletes are stars who go on to the professional leagues and benefit from athletic participation in regard to athletic training and increased visibility, the greatest compensation available for a student-athlete remains to be a bachelor’s degree. Among Division I football and basketball players, only around half of the student-athletes ever manage to earn the degree (Zimbalist, 1999). The exploitation of student-athletes has been noted to take root in the admissions office as many are given special admission with academic preparation well below the average admitted student.

In a study of admissions data to determine the advantage of athletic ability in the admissions process, Shulman and Bowen (2001) looked at an array of factors, including type of sport, level of competition, student generation, and gender. While admissions has become more competitive overall, the researchers found that the athletic admissions advantage had increased greatly as “the recruited athlete who entered college in 1999 had a 48 percent greater chance of being admitted than the average student at large, after controlling for differences in SAT scores” (p. 58). In the same study, the researchers also

concluded that the typical athlete is admitted with lower SAT scores and academic credentials than his classmates; in turn, it can be deduced that these students are admitted being less academically prepared than their peers (Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

This admissions advantage could be in large part due to a shortage of athletically and academically gifted students needed to maintain a highly competitive (and winning) athletic program. With the pressures of a maintaining a winning program, coaches find every edge possible in securing high profile recruits, and in many instances even the minimum admission standards are compromised (Duderstadt, 2003). In fact, it is known that coaches have even negotiated for a certain number of “wild card” admissions in arguing the need for greater flexibility than the university typically allows, creating an environment of under the table admits. As former President of the University of Michigan James Duderstadt (2003) noted, “All too frequently, the competitive pressure on coaches lends them to recruit athletes who are clearly unprepared for college work or who have little interest in a college education” (p. 193).

As can be seen from this short review on the history and commercialization of college sport, the field has developed quickly over a relatively short period of time from the conception of the first athletic competition. College sport may bring value to an institution, its students, and the public, but may coincide with a tangled web of issues that may jeopardize the institution’s primary educational mission. An understanding of the history, development, and commercialization of college athletics serves as a critical foundation to understand the context of the student-athlete experience in the current Division I athletic environment.

Research and Literature on Adjustment to College

Earliest studies on how students experience college have shown that the first year of college is a stressful life period (Compas, Wagner, Slavin, & Vannatta, 1986) and that integration and adjustment into the academic and social life of the institution has an important impact on the student's sense of institutional commitment which, in turn, predicates retention to the institution (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1977; Tinto, 1993). Tinto (1993) noted that the difficulty in adjusting to college generally arises from two sources: from the inability of individuals to separate themselves from past forms of association typically characteristic of the local high school and peer groups, and from the need of the individual to adjust to more challenging social and intellectual demands which college imposes upon students. Later in his text, Tinto (1993) warned that the time of highest risk for withdrawal is within the first-year of the transition to college, as the individual is then least integrated into and therefore least committed to the institution.

Without a successful adjustment to college, students are less likely to return, which jeopardizes the typically most desired goal of college: graduation. Based on research by Tinto (1993) and Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), persistence in college and retention can often be viewed as a student's reflection of his or her satisfaction. Therefore, adjustment to college and satisfaction with the college experience are critical when discussing the student experience and the discussion is complex. Researchers have shown that the adjustment to college is multifaceted and requires coping strategies for a multitude of demands that are differentially effective (Baker & Siryk, 1986).

Finding strategies to cope with demands and facilitate the transition from high school to college is of paramount importance for institutions to be able to help students transition well. How well students meet the demands of college has been labeled in the literature as *adjustment* (Feldt, Graham, & Dew, 2011). In Feldt, Graham, and Dew (2011), areas of adjustment from a compilation of researchers have been listed to include psychological adjustment, mental illness, anxiety, depression, anger, mood, coping, positive adaptation, domain satisfaction, effective psychological functioning, and well-being.

From the many terms used to define the adjustment to college, Lent (2004) termed adjustment as *psychosocial wellness*. To Lent (2004), *psychosocial* recognizes the importance of both intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning while *wellness* assumes the nature of health to be a dynamic state and process rather than a static description of an endpoint. Psychosocial wellness in the first-year transition from high school to college can be described as how well students are prepared to handle the “independent functioning that accompany the college transition, including developing an academic schedule, negotiating a new and complex social world, and developing the internal motivation to wake up at a reasonable time, attend classes, and keep up with assignments” (Mattanah, Hancock, & Brand, 2004, p. 213).

In an attempt to measure these areas of adjustment specifically related to the high-school-to-college period of adjustment, Baker and Siryk (1999) developed the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). In addition to measuring overall adjustment to college, the SACQ measures adjustment to college in four subscales:

Academic Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Personal-Emotional Adjustment, and Attachment to the Institution. The researchers designed the measurement to be used in counseling interventions and basic research on how well a student is adapting to the demands of the college experience. More specifically, one of the primary purposes of Baker and Siryk's developing the measure was to allow colleges and universities to identify and intervene with students in the first year of college that may be a risk for retention and attrition (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Feldt, Graham, and Dew's (2011) survey of the literature, they found that the SACQ has been used to identify psychosocial correlates of college adjustment, as a measure in attempt to predict facets of college adjustment, to monitor college adjustment of a cohort of first-year students to improve retention, and in a program evaluation to assess the results of counseling. Using the SACQ, researchers have found that peer friendships and the quality of friendships play a role and may even serve as a predictor for positive adjustment to college (Boute et. al., 2007; Swensen, Nordstrom, & Hiester, 2008); that students of different races may adjust differently to college (McDonald & Vrana, 2007; Melendez & Melendez, 2010); and that emotional and social adjustment has been found to be more predictive of retention than academic adjustment (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994).

Pritchard, Gregory, and Wilson (2007) were among the first researchers to use a longitudinal study to test for changes related to entry into college and found that the college experience may cause physical and psychological distress. In a study on attachment and loneliness in college freshmen, Wei, Russell, and Zakalik (2005) found

that freshmen college students with high levels of attachment anxiety and avoidance may need different and distinct interventions to help them adjust to college life.

Under the assumption that stress is closely related to poor psychological adjustment but adequate social support and coping behaviors mediate that relationship, Asberg, Bowers, Renk, and McKinney (2008), found numerous differences based on sex of the individual in variables related to emerging adult adjustment. Specially, the researchers found that females reported higher perceived stress than did males, but male and female participants did not differ in their reports of stress from specific negative life events. Females perceived themselves as having more adequate social support, and they tended to utilize support-seeking behaviors in response to stress more than the male participants. The researchers also found that female participants reported more depressive symptoms and anxiety compared to their male participant counterparts (Asberg, Bowers, Renk, and McKinney, 2008). While this finding does not equate to males being less clinically depressed than their female participant counterparts, it does point to a difference in coping strategies.

Research has shown that minority students may experience the adjustment to college differently than their majority classmates (Guiffreda & Douthit, 2010; Melendez & Melendez, 2010). In an attempt to examine the African American student experience at predominantly White institutions, Guiffreda and Douthit (2010) noted that African American students are often unable to form strong relationships with White faculty, which is troublesome as faculty student relationships are strongly positively correlated to student satisfaction with college, academic achievement, and retention. The authors

noted that a second factor related to college retention of African American students is the relationship with friends and families at home. Successful college students need to break away from their families and friends from home to begin integration into the social and academic realms of college, and it has been found that African American students have a more difficult time than White students at breaking away from families and friends at home. A third factor related to academic achievement of African American students has to do with involvement in African American student organizations, as integration into the campus culture is a critical component to retention and a successful adjustment to college (Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010).

The fact that students of color may face discontinuity between their family and college values and expectations may play a larger role in the adjustment to college than has been noted. Melendez and Melendez (2010) found that the discontinuity can make college demands more stressful for students of color than for their White peers. For the students of color, and especially women of color, in Melendez and Melendez's 2010 study, involvement in college activities, programs, and assistance from college faculty and staff was limited in comparison to White students and it was more difficult for the students of color to establish social and cultural networks among peers. The establishment of these networks and support systems has been shown to be a critical component of the successful adaptation to college.

McDonald and Vrana (2007) found that racial attitudes predicted college adjustment in different ways for African American students and White students. For African American students, social comfort with White students was positively related to

college adjustment regardless of level of comfort with African American students; therefore, the results suggested that feeling more comfortable with White students may improve an African American student's college adjustment in an environment at a predominantly White institution (p. 136). The researchers suggested intentional programming during the first-year that would provide an opportunity for African American students to have increased interracial contact in order to have an opportunity to develop social comfort and lead to reduced feelings of isolation and alienation, resulting in a better adjustment to college.

International students may face barriers in adapting to college that are different than those faced by their domestic peers. International students require specialized interventions due to the unique aspects of their transition, including language barriers, cultural differences, and personal and social vulnerability (Andrade, 2006; Mori, 2000.) Noting that developing supporting friendships is essential for successful adaptation to college, Glass, Gomez and Urzua (2014) examined international student adaptation in an attempt to determine how region of origin played a role in the ability to engage in the information culture of an institution through recreation participation and intercultural friendship formation. The researchers found that due to cultural differences in the home countries of origin, international students may have constraints on active participation in recreation and leisure activities, which inhibits a prominent aspect of intercultural friendship formation and adaptation to college. In a study of first-year international students, Kovtun (2011) described the challenges faced by international students as being associated with foundational differences between the educational systems in their home

countries and the systems in the United States and as differences in cultural norms and expectations; failure to overcome those challenges clearly inhibits international students' academic and cultural adaptation.

Based on the literature, it can be concluded that the process of adjusting from high school to college can be difficult, stressful and confusing for students, and may differ amongst college students based on sex and ethnicity. Research has shown that students of color may experience more potential hurdles and have a more difficult time adjusting to college at predominantly White institutions than White students do. Adjustment to college is clearly a function of numerous psychological, social, emotional, developmental, and cultural factors (Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010; Tinto, 1993).

Research and Literature on Student-Athlete Adjustment to College

In examining the particulars of student-athlete adjustment to college, we must first understand the uniqueness of the student-athlete experience. In a commentary on the lives of student-athletes, Harmon (2010) recalled what she had learned from working in athletic support services at a Division I institution and suggested the critical importance of understanding that student-athletes are not celebrities or stars but are simply college students dealing with the same adjustment issues facing every other college student on campus. They may be portrayed in the media as gloried athletes, but they are facing the same issues as all college students. Harmon (2010) wrote:

It was intimidating to walk around the athletic services center, surrounded by football players I'd only seen on the news or read about in papers, towering basketball players, and strong, confident, athletic women. However, I quickly

realized that these were also just students, struggling with their course work, exploring their identity, and learning to navigate social relationships, but with the added responsibility of twenty hours a week devoted to their sport. (p. 28)

As Jay Coakley (2007) discussed, student-athletes in highly competitive athletic programs often have athletic time and energy commitments that may interfere with coursework and academic success making it difficult to be both a good athlete and a good student. Researchers have found Coakley's (2007) sentiments to ring true, as they have found that student-athletes may struggle in adjusting to the demands of balancing athletic participation with the identity of being a student first (Adler & Adler, 1991; Comeaux & Harrison, 2011; Howard-Hamilton & Sina, 2001; Lubker & Etzel, 2007; Watt & Moore, 2001).

In one of the most notable works researching college athletes and identity development, Adler and Adler (1991) found that the student-athletes they researched often began college optimistic about the academic experience, expecting it to all fall into place, but the conflict between their athletic and academic roles and obligations became problematic as the athletic season drew near. They found that the "idealism of their freshman year gave way to disappointment and growing cynicism as they realized the difficulties involved in getting their academic work done" (p. 148).

The researchers also noted that when it became difficult to balance the role of a student and athlete, the student-athletes generally allowed academics to give way for focus on athletics. They found that the student-athletes experienced hurdles to success in the time commitment required for athletics, games and road trips, banquets and booster

obligations, immediate athletic feedback and recognition versus long-term reinforcement of academic recognition, and their coaches' attitudes toward academics (Adler & Adler, 1991). Simmons and Van Rheezen (2000) argued that negative stereotypes of student-athletes attributed to lower expectations by faculty members, and this negative stereotype may reinforce to the student-athlete the need to focus on athletics rather than academics. In their study, Simmons and Van Rheezen (2000) determined that there was a strong relationship between grade point average and commitment and exploitation. They found that student-athletes with strong commitments to their athletic identity, along with student-athletes who felt they were being exploited by the university, had significantly lower grade point averages than those student-athletes who focused more on academics than athletics. Gaston-Gayles (2004) added to the body of literature in examining academic and athletic motivation and found that ACT score, ethnicity, and academic motivation were influential in predicting academic performance of student-athletes.

While there are commonalities in issues student-athletes face when adjusting to college, it should be noted that there may be a difference in adjustment issues of student-athletes in revenue producing (football, men's basketball and in some cases women's basketball) and non-revenue producing sports (Pascarella, Bohr, Nora & Terenzini, 1995; Pascarella et al., 1999; Comeaux, Speer, Taustin, & Harrison, 2011). Pascarella et al. (1995) found that male football and basketball players had significantly lower end-of-first-year scores on standardized measures of reading comprehension and mathematics than male non-athletes or male athletes participating in non-revenue producing sports. Pascarella et al. (1999) expanded on the researchers' initial work to conclude that male

football and basketball players' early pattern of lower end-of-year scores extended into the second and third years of college as well. In looking at females and males in non-revenue producing sports, it was found that those participants derive as much cognitively out of college as do nonathletes (Pascarella et al., 1995 and Pascarella et al., 1999).

Comeaux et al. (2011) researched the engagement of first-year Division I student-athletes and found that student-athletes participating in revenue and non-revenue producing sports differ regarding their academic and athletic identities. The researchers found that purposeful engagement in academic related activities had a positive influence on the general academic self-concept of student-athletes in both revenue and non-revenue producing sports (Comeaux et al., 2011).

Within the struggle to balance the demands of athletics and academics, much of the national conversation revolves around the scrutiny of low graduation rates of African American student-athletes in football and men's basketball. Some of this scrutiny points to low admissions standards and admitting underprepared student-athletes. However, admissions criteria are generally based on high school grade point average and standardized test score, which are cognitive variables. In an effort to determine if factors other than admissions criteria can be viewed as a way to examine the student-athlete experience, researchers have studied non-cognitive variables. In a review of the literature examining non-cognitive variables as barriers to persistence among African American college athletes, Rhonda Hyatt (2003) noted that growing evidence suggests that non-academic or non-cognitive variables may play a more critical role in persistence and success for minority students and special needs students such as student-athletes. The

author explains non-cognitive variable as “personal or social beliefs, motivations and attitudes of the individual student or members of the campus community that affect the student’s decision to persist” (p. 263). Hyatt (2003) determined that the main non-cognitive variables serving as barriers to persistence were commitment, integration, discrimination and isolation, with the levels of integration and the presence of discrimination and isolation ultimately affecting the student’s level of commitment.

In another study on the impact of non-cognitive factors on academic performance and persistence of student-athletes, Ting (2009) found that SAT scores were comparatively weak or invalid predictors of first-year academic success, and that the non-cognitive predictors of positive self-concept, preference for long-term goals, demonstrated community service, and acquired knowledge in a field were stronger predictors of first-year academic success. Recognizing that these non-cognitive variables play a key role in the success of student-athletes and what those variables are is of critical importance in planning student support programs assisting with the transition to college of student-athletes.

Due to the proportionally large number of African American student-athletes participating in revenue producing sports, the experience of African Americans as student-athletes in college has been studied widely (Bimper & Harrison, 2011; Bruening, Armstrong & Pastore, 2005; Coakley, 2007; Comeaux, 2011; Czopp, 2010; Hawkins, 2010; Purdy, Eitzen & Hufnagel, 1985; Reynolds, Fisher & Cavil, 2012). In one of the early foundational articles on the student-athlete experience in college athletics, Purdy, Eitzen and Hufnagel (1985) researched the academic achievements and preparations of

student-athletes and found that African American student-athletes often arrive at college unprepared for the academic challenge and opportunity that lies ahead of them in college. They found that African Americans had lower test scores, grade point averages, and an overall lack of academic focus compared to the rest of the student body and also their White peers. In other research (Hawkins, 1999), the African American student-athlete has been compared to a migrant laborer due to their conformity to the new social settings where they are “outnumbered” and likely to be a minority member, and by their roles as exploited workers in an economic profit system of college athletics where they have little actual economic power.

In another work, Hawkins (2010) noted that the role of mass media has given the public a limited view of the experience of the African American athlete as the focus is generally on the African American athlete’s athletic prowess. He continued, “It is a perspective that often fuels the racial ideology that Black athletes are intellectually inferior but physically superior because they are specifically recruited for their athletic ability and tolerated as students, or again looked upon in amused contempt” (Hawkins, 2010, p. 59). Therefore, based on the picture painted by the media, for an African American student-athlete, the expectation that athletic success should be the primary focus of his or her college experience may already be ingrained in his or her mind.

In examining demographic factors related to African American student-athlete success, Reynolds, Fisher and Cavil (2012) determined that male basketball student-athletes performed lower academically when compared to their female counterparts and opined that a large number of African American male athletes focus more on their

athletic performance, identity, and playing professionally than on academics. The researchers suggested that African American female student-athletes may enter college more focused on graduation than their African American male student-athlete counterparts due to the lack of professional opportunities available to females after collegiate careers.

Researchers have also found differences in how faculty may view African American student-athletes versus their White student-athlete peers (Comeaux, 2011; Comeaux & Harrison, 2011). Studies have shown a benefit for student-athlete and faculty interactions and noted that these relationships may vary by race; differences have been found between White and African American student-athletes in their various forms of interaction with faculty, as faculty were not found to play as significant a role for help in achieving professional goals for African American students (Comeaux, 2011).

Another study found that White persons providing career-related guidance often advised the African American male student-athlete to focus less on school than sports and to spend less time per week on academic-related tasks than athletic-related tasks than the White male student-athlete peer (Czopp, 2010). African American student-athletes may face hurdles with faculty and staff stereotyping in adjusting to college than their non-student-athlete and even White student-athlete peers may not face.

Deaner (2009) examined the particulars of the female student-athlete culture and implored readers to understand that issues such as gender disparities, sexual harassment, gender role conflict, relationships with coaches and teammates and striving for thinness and perfectionism are unique issues faced by the female student-athlete must face that

their male student-athlete counterparts do not. Sellers, Kipermine and Damas (1997) found that African American female student-athletes' college life experiences differed in meaningful ways from both White female and African American male student-athletes. In addition to overall differed experiences, the researchers found that African American female student-athletes are a "double minority" and faced some of the challenges that African American males experience while also facing other challenges that female student-athletes experienced; therefore, their experience of adjustment to college as a student-athlete has a unique set of challenges. Bruening, Armstrong and Pastore (2005) referenced the literature in supporting this "double minority" status in clarifying that it cannot be assumed that the college experiences of African American female student-athletes do not differ in meaningful ways from either African American male student-athletes or White female student-athletes. The researchers found that African American female student-athletes may feel silenced in their college experiences relating to feeling less important and having their needs met compared to their White female peers and male counterparts of all ethnicities (Bruening, Armstrong & Pastore, 2005).

As is evidenced in the literature, student-athletes face inherent and unique challenges in adapting to college. Two of the biggest challenges are finding the appropriate balance between academics and athletics and developing an appropriate identity as a student and athlete. A student-athlete's experience of transitioning to college may vary by gender, race, ethnicity, and whether revenue or non-revenue sport, and each student-athlete's own obstacles in the adjustment to college process may require

adequate support in order for him or her to be a successful student-athlete in the commercialized and high-pressured world of college athletics.

Research and Literature on Athlete Satisfaction

In conjunction with exploring how the adjustment to college affects student-athletes, examining a student-athlete's levels of satisfaction with his or her athletic experience is important in understanding the holistic experience of a student-athlete. Researchers have suggested that a student's satisfaction is positively related to academic performance, has a role in retention decisions, and affects an overall perceived quality of an educational experience (Athiyaman, 1997; Bean & Bradley, 1986; Bolton, Kannan, & Bramlett, 2000). As entertainers and constituents of college athletic organizations, it can be argued that athletes are viewed as employees while coaches would be viewed as employers or leaders of the sport experience; therefore, athlete satisfaction could be assigned the same level of importance as job satisfaction (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Initial athlete satisfaction research was focused on satisfactions with leadership. Chelladurai (1984) argued that there were many leadership models proposed and used within psychology but the research specific to athletic leadership was lacking a true leadership model; therefore, he created the Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML) (Chelladurai, 1980; Chelladurai & Carron, 1978). The MML examined three aspects of leadership behavior: 1) actual leader behavior; 2) leader behavior preferred by subordinates; and 3) required leader behavior. The model assumes that outcomes of performance and athlete satisfaction are directly related to the degree of which all three aspects of leader behavior are in congruence (Chelladurai, 1984). Within Chelladurai's

(1980) framework of the MML, athlete satisfaction is considered multifaceted and contains the four areas of individual performance, team performance, leadership, and team involvement.

Much of the research on athlete satisfaction had focused on satisfaction as an outcome variable until Chelladurai (1984) studied satisfaction with personal performance, team performance and team involvement. This initial study showed that discrepancy between perceived leader behavior and athletes' preferences for such behavior were strongly associated with satisfaction in leadership. Chelladurai's (1984) also discovered that an emphasis on training and instruction behaviors related positively to athlete satisfaction and that athletes preferred to have their coach provide the training and instruction needed to improve and have success.

Researchers have examined satisfaction as relating to wins and losses and argue that wins and losses do not necessarily reflect the relative performance of athletic teams since wins and losses in athletic competitions is very often determined by factors such as luck, an opponent's performance, good or bad officiating, etc. Wins and losses cannot be viewed to necessarily reflect the relative performance of athletic teams (Courneya & Chelladurai, 1991; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) contended that wins and losses do not exist as absolute events and that athlete satisfaction, by itself, is a primary outcome of other psychological factors such as leadership and cohesion and it presents a perspective not reached by performance-based approaches of study (p. 129). The researchers have defined athlete satisfaction as "a positive affective state resulting from a complex

evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the athletic experience” (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997). These evaluations could be a function of need satisfaction or the differences between an athlete’s wants or expectations and perceptions of what has been received; therefore, athlete satisfaction can be viewed as the extent to which experiences meet an athlete’s own personal standards (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). Therefore, the greater the disparity between an athlete’s experiences with his or her own personal standards, the more dissatisfaction the athlete is believed to have.

Based on the available literature surrounding satisfaction, Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) developed satisfaction categories in athletics such as individual task outcomes, team task outcomes, individual social outcomes, team social outcomes, individual task processes, team task processes, team social processes, and individual social processes. The researchers used these categories to generate and develop the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) as an instrument to measure the different facets of athlete satisfaction (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

In its initial development, the ASQ contained 15 facets to measure satisfaction, with five specific thematic areas as follows: satisfaction with aspects of performance (i.e., individual performance), the team (i.e., integration of the individual to the team), the organization (i.e., sport budget), leadership (i.e., ability utilization), and the individual correlates of sport involvement (i.e., personal dedication) (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) underwent three steps in developing the initial questionnaire. The initial step involved generating items for the facets suggested by

Chelladurai and Reimer (1997), which included using items from Whittal and Orlick's (1978) Sport Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), adapting items from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) and the Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969), developing new items to fit the content of the facets, and using responses of current and former athletes to an open-ended questionnaire about satisfaction (Reimer & Chelladurai, 1998).

The second step of development included refinement by confirmatory analyses to begin the process of establishing the instrument's validity. Confirmatory analyses provided initial evidence of the ASQ's construct validity, but Reimer and Chelladurai (1998) added scales measuring commitment and negative affectivity in order to verify the criterion validity (p. 137). The final step of development of the ASQ was concerned with the final estimates of validity and reliability. In order to confirm the factor structure of the final version of the instrument, a confirmatory factor analyses was carried out with the total sample of participants involved in the previous step of development and it was determined that the model had good fit (Reimer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Through the three steps of development, the finalized 56-item ASQ was based on research and exhibited evidence of being a psychometrically and sound scale measuring 15 psychologically meaningful facets of athlete satisfaction. Those facets identified reflected the more relevant targets in the athletic context, including individual and team performance, leadership, team, organization, and the individual him or herself (Reimer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Researchers have used ASQ to examine a variety of topics related to athlete satisfaction including perceptions of role ambiguity (Eys, Carron, Bray & Beauchamp, 2003), relationships between academic and athletic satisfaction (Phillips, 2007), relationships between evaluations of academic support services and student-athletes' career decision-making self-efficacy (Burns, Jasinski, Dunn & Fletcher, 2013), and the relationship between athletic satisfaction and intrateam communication (Sullivan & Gee, 2007).

In summary, student satisfaction can be a key component in retention for college students and worthy of study for academic support programs charged with assisting to increase the retention and graduation of college students. Therefore, student satisfaction within the subgroup of student-athletes may play a critical role in the college adjustment experience of student-athletes. While satisfaction has been studied from a variety of perspectives in psychology, Reimer and Chelladurai (1998) offer the most extensive tool to measure athlete satisfaction in the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ).

Chapter 3

Methods

Introduction and Research Questions

The following chapter details the methods and procedures used in this study and includes a description of the research questions, design of the study, site and population, instrumentation and survey, procedures, and a description of the procedures used for analyzing the data. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between various facets of athletic satisfaction and specific areas of adjustment from high school to college for Division 1A intercollegiate athletes. The study is guided by six research questions as follows:

1. What is the relationship between student-athletes' satisfaction with their athletic experiences and their adjustments to college?
2. How does the relationship discovered by research question one vary by: gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing vs. non-revenue producing), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship)?
3. How does the relationship discovered by research question one vary by subscale of adjustment in academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and attachment to the institution?
4. How does the relationship discovered by research question one vary by subscale of athletic satisfaction in individual performance, team performance, ability utilization, strategy, personal treatment, training and instruction, team task contribution, team social contribution, ethics, team integration, personal

- dedication, budget, medical personnel, academic support services, and external agents?
5. How does the relationship discovered by research question three vary controlling for differences by: gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing vs. non-revenue producing), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship)?
 6. How do the relationships discovered by research question four vary controlling for differences by: gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing vs. non-revenue), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship)?

Research Design, Site and Population

This research used a correlational research design to determine the strength of relationships between the variables of interest in measuring student adaptation to college and athletic satisfaction. The sample for this research study consisted of 76 student-athletes from an NCAA Division I FBS university representing 16 athletic teams participating in the Southeastern Conference. The sample included 42 male and 34 female first year student-athletes. Each student-athlete was enrolled as a full-time student at the time of the research.

The student-athletes were enrolled in a Southeastern university with an enrollment of over 27,000 students. The University's website listed an undergraduate population consisting of over 21,000 students who were approximately 51% male and 49% female

with 21% being ethnic minorities. The undergraduate population was representative of 48 states within the United States and 74 foreign nations.

The academic programs vary across the undergraduate level as the university is divided into nine undergraduate colleges. At the undergraduate level, the university offers over 90 academic majors and 85 minors. The institution is a public, land grant university, accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and is classified as a top tier research institution.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used to gather data from the participants measuring their adaptation to college and their athletic satisfaction. Additionally, a demographic questionnaire was used for the purpose of collecting descriptive information and to use as statistical controls. The two instruments are the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) (Baker & Siryk, 1986) and the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ)

As referenced in Chapter 2, the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ) is a 67-item, self-report questionnaire designed to measure student adjustment to college and has an underlying assumption that adjustment to college is multifaceted and requires a variety of coping responses or adjustments, which vary in effectiveness. Each item of the questionnaire relates to one of the many facets of adjusting to college and to how well the student is coping with that demand (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

In addition to measuring total adjustment to college and as described previously in Table 2, the SACQ is divided into four subscales that focus on specific aspects of adjustment to college including *Academic Adjustment*, *Social Adjustment*, *Personal-Emotional Adjustment*, and *Institutional Attachment*. The *Academic Adjustment* subscale consists is made of up 24 items that refer to various academic demands typical of the college experience. Examples of areas measured in this subscale include attitudes toward academic goals and the academic work required, the efficacy or success of academic effort as reflected in various aspects of academic performance, and satisfaction with the academic environment and what it offers. Lower scores in the *Academic Adjustment* subscale are associated with: a lower grade point average in the freshman year; being on academic probation; feelings of lack of control over the outcome of academic efforts; unstable and age-inappropriate goals; and less realistic self-appraisal (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

The *Social Adjustment* subscale is scored from 20 items that are relevant to the interpersonal demands related to adjustment to college in the social realm and is intended to measure how well a student is adjusting to the social aspects of college. This subscale measures areas such as the extent and success of social activities and functioning in general, involvement and relationships with other persons on campus, dealing with social relocation and being away from home, and satisfaction with the social aspects of the college environment. Correlates of the subscale indicate that lower scores are associated with: less participation in social activities in college; less success in separating from home ties and establishing social autonomy; greater sense of loneliness, greater social

avoidance and social distress, and less social self-confidence and social self-concept; less success in coping with life changes; less perceived social support; and perceptions of little opportunity for involvement in social activities (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

The third subscale, *Personal-Emotional Adjustment*, consists of 15 items intended to measure how the student is feeling psychologically and physically in terms of how the student is experiencing psychological distress and any associated psycho-somatic problems. Lower scores on this subscale indicate association with: greater likelihood of being known to a campus psychological services center; greater emotional reliance on other persons; fewer psychological coping resources; lesser degree of mental health or psychological well-being, or greater degree of psychological distress, including anxiety and depression; and greater experience of negative life events (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Finally, the *Institutional Attachment* subscale contains 15 items aimed at determining the student's feelings about being in college, generally, and the college he or she is attending, specifically, and focuses mainly on the quality of the relationship or bond between the student and the institution. Lower scores on the *Institutional Attachment* subscale are associated with a greater likelihood of discontinuance of enrollment and less overall satisfaction with the college experience (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

Each item of the SACQ is a statement that the student responds to on a 9-point scale ranging from "applies very closely to me" to "doesn't apply to me at all" and the student indicates the point on the scale that best represents the degree to which the statement is true for him or her at the time of questioning. The values from 1 to 9 have

been assigned to successive positions in a continuum that ranges from less adaptive to more adaptive adjustment, respectively, and 34 of the 67 items are negatively keyed (ranging in reverse from 9 to 1). The sum of items contained in each specific subscale equal the student's adjustment to college in that category while the sum of all 67 items equal the student's total adjustment to college. When interpreting scores, the higher the score, the better the adjustment (Baker & Siryk, 1999). The complete SACQ may be found in Appendix A.

Reliability and Validity of the SACQ

With regard to psychometric properties, the SACQ has established Cronbach's alpha of .92 - .95 for the total instrument. Subscale alpha's have been determined at .81 - .90 for the *Academic Adjustment* subscale, .83 - .91 for the *Social Adjustment* subscale, .77 - .86 for the *Personal-Emotional Adjustment* subscale, and .85 - .91 for the *Institutional Attachment* subscale (Baker & Siryk, 1999).

In terms of validity, the subscales are found to relate to a statistically significant degree to several criterion variables relative to adjustment to college to particular subscales. Criterion variables representing significant behaviors or accomplishments in the lives of students include attrition, appeals for services from a psychological clinic, grade point average, election into an academic honor society, involvement in social activities, and outcome of application for resident assistant positions (Baker & Siryk, 1984). As greater indications of validity, other researchers found the scale to reflect predicted differences among black students in their adjustment to predominantly white colleges as a function of differences in prior interracial experience (Graham, Baker, &

Wapner, 1985). The scale has also been found to predict differences among students in relation of prematriculation expectations to postmatriculation perceptions of self-assessed adjustment to college as those differences in turn relate to other behavioral expressions of adjustment to college (Baker, McNeil, & Siryk, 1985).

In a comparison of the SACQ with similar instruments measuring facets of a student's adjustment to college, researchers found the comprehensive approach proposed and operationalized through the SACQ to be superior in terms of the worthy purposes for which it was developed (Dahmus & Bernardin, 1992).

Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ)

As described in Chapter 2, the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998) is a survey that uses a multidimensional approach to determine the participant's satisfaction of athletic experiences. The ASQ has 15 different subscales that allow a collegiate student-athlete to evaluate relating to his or her athletic experience and the description of the subscales can be found in the previously referenced Table 1. A theoretically-grounded instrument, the ASQ has proven to be useful in investigating many facets of athlete satisfaction.

The ASQ is an instrument consisting of 56 questions related to the athletic experiences of collegiate student-athletes which are answered in the form of a 7-point Likert type scale from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 7 (extremely satisfied) (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). In scoring the responses, the researcher is able to determine results in 15 subscales of satisfaction as referenced in Table 1 (Riemer & Chelladurai, 2002).

The results of the 15 subscales of satisfaction also represent five broad themes: satisfaction with performance (both team and individual performance), satisfaction with leadership, satisfaction with the team, satisfaction with the organization, and a total sum score for overall satisfaction. When interpreting scores, the higher the score, the higher the satisfaction with both total experience with athletics and each individual subscale (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Reliability and Validity of the ASQ

The ASQ has demonstrated strong reliability for each subscale measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficients $> .70$ and has been validated with college populations (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). The internal consistency coefficients were calculated for all factors and ranged from .78 to .95 (mean = .88) and were higher than .85 in 12 of the 15 subscales, higher than .80 in one, and were .78 and .79 in the remaining two (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Both construct and content validity has been established for the ASQ. In developing construct validity, qualitative measures were used to produce items, including expert opinion and judgment, and procedures that grouped items in relevant facets. In establishing content validity a panel of experts was asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the items assigned to each facet and to propose any new items. Due to the lack of other multidimensional measures of athlete satisfaction, concurrent validity tests could be undertaken (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Demographic Survey

The participants completed a demographic survey anonymously, to allow for demographic grouping and provide the controlling variables used in analyzing the data. The demographic questions consisted of the following categorical variables: gender, racial/ethnic background, sport of participation, whether or not receiving financial aid in the form of an athletic scholarship of any amount, and semester of matriculation. These variables have been selected from the literature on satisfaction with athletic experience as well as the literature on adjustment from high school to college.

Procedures

Approval for the conduct of the research study was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the university at which the participants resided. After receiving IRB approval, the student-athletes were approached for participation in the study. The student-athletes were in sport organized mandatory team meetings or study halls during the last two weeks of the spring academic semester. The researcher was granted permission by the Associate Director of Athletics, athletics coaches, and Director of the Athletics Student-Life Center to survey the student-athletes during these meetings. In these sessions, the students' academic counselors from the Athletics Student Life Center requested their participation in the study.

After the academic counselor provided the participants with instructions, notification that their participation was voluntary, and the confidentiality statement, participants were asked to sign the informed consent document located on the front page of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) and that return of the completed surveys

constituted their informed consent. The academic counselor explained how the data were to be anonymously collected and reported, and that there would be no penalty for declining to participate. Participants were asked to complete two survey instruments: the ASQ and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). Although the SACQ asks participants for identifying information, participants were asked not to complete that section. To take extra precaution in keeping anonymity, that specific section on each SACQ survey was marked out with permanent marker. Participants were instead asked to complete the demographic questionnaire in conjunction with the ASQ.

Each instrument was assigned a number in the top right-hand corner and participants were given instruments with matching numbers for correlation procedures. For example, participant X completed ASQ #37 and also SACQ #37. Therefore, statistical correlations could be investigated while this also served as a safeguard to the identity of the participants as the data set contained no specific identifying aspects of the individual who completed the surveys. After allowing time for completion, the participants were asked to return both completed surveys by placing them in an envelope held by the academic counselor. All envelopes containing completed surveys were stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's office and kept secure until the data were analyzed. The data from the SACQ, ASQ, and demographic survey were entered as a data set into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences program.

Data Analysis

The following section covering data analysis is laid out with regard to the data

analysis procedures undertaken to answer each research question. To answer research question one, I first determined a total adjustment to college score based on the SACQ and a total athletic satisfaction score based on the ASQ for each respondent. Next, I performed bivariate correlation tests to measure the relationship between each respondent's total athletic satisfaction and total adjustment to college. This method of analyzing data is consistent with recommendations by Coladarci, Cobb, Minium, & Clarke (2008) in using bivariate correlation tests to measure the degree of linear association between two quantitative variables.

Using bivariate correlation tests, the *Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation* (Pearson r) indicated the overall relationship between the variables. A p -value using an alpha of $<.10$ was used to indicate the acceptable level of type 1 error.

In order to answer research question two, I performed separate Pearson correlations of Total Athletic Satisfaction and Total Adjustment to College by:

- a. male vs. female
- b. Caucasian vs. African American
- c. revenue-producing vs. non-revenue producing
- d. scholarship vs. non-scholarship

In order to answer research question three, I examined separate Pearson coefficient correlations of Total Athletic Satisfaction and the four subscales of adjustment to college. In order to answer research question four, I examined separate Pearson coefficient correlations of Total Adjustment to College and the fifteen subscales of athletic satisfaction.

In order to answer research question five, I examined the separate Pearson coefficient correlations found in research question three by gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing or non-revenue producing), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship). In order to answer research question six, I examined the separate Pearson coefficient correlations found in research question four by gender of student-athlete, ethnicity of student-athlete, type of sport (revenue producing or non-revenue producing), and athletic aid status (scholarship vs. non-scholarship).

Chapter 4

Results

The following chapter details the results from the analysis of the data as described previously in Chapter 3. Following a listing of the demographic description of participants, results are presented for each of the six research questions. The significance of the p-value of each correlation coefficient is indicated in the tables as follows: *** = p value .000 - .010, ** = p value .011 - .050, * = p value .051-.100.

Demographic Information

A total of 76 first-year student-athletes at the selected university participated in the study. The participants included 42 males and 34 females. The participants self-reported ethnicity and included 24 Black/African American, one American Indian/Native American, one Hispanic/Latino(a), 47 Caucasian, two International, and one Other. For the purposes of data analysis involving ethnicity, only the data from the 24 Black/African American and 47 Caucasian student-athletes were used. The participants included student-athletes from 10 teams and of the research participants on those teams, 19 are considered revenue-producing (football, men's basketball and women's basketball) and 57 are considered non-revenue-producing (baseball, track and field/cross country, golf, swimming and diving, tennis, soccer, softball, and volleyball). The participants included 58 scholarship student-athletes and 18 non-scholarship student-athletes.

Results from Research Question 1

For research question one, the result from the data analysis showed the estimated correlation between Total Adjustment to College and Total Athletic Satisfaction is .450

and is highly significantly different from zero ($p = .000$). Unsurprisingly, adjustment to college and athletic satisfaction did have a relationship. The experiences of student-athletes are intertwined as there is a relationship between the separate experiences of the student and the athlete.

Results from Research Question 2

Table 3 shows that for the student-athletes in this study, both the female and male student-athletes showed a positive relationship between athletic satisfaction and total adjustment to college. However, the correlational relationship was driven by female student-athletes in this study, as the male student-athletes showed a weaker correlation between overall adjustment and overall satisfaction with the athletic experience. Therefore, whether or not they were satisfied with the athletic experience made more of a difference to the females in this study in terms on their adjustment to college.

Table 3: Correlations of Total ASQ and Total SACQ by Subgroup

	Male	Female
ρ	.304*	.557***
p-value	.051	.001
	Caucasian	African American
ρ	.533***	0.168
p-value	.000	0.433
	Revenue	Non-Revenue
ρ	-.117	.618***
p-value	.634	.000
	Scholarship	Non-Scholarship
ρ	.421***	.552**
p-value	.001	.017

For the student-athletes in this study, only the Caucasian student-athletes showed a positive relationship between athletic satisfaction and total adjustment to college. For African American student-athletes in this study, there was no correlation between overall adjustment and overall satisfaction with the athletic experience. The lack of a significant relationship between overall athletic satisfaction and total adjustment to college for African American student-athletes could be due to high adjustment and high satisfaction or low adjustment and low satisfaction where no relationship between the two was evident. While it is consistent with the literature that African American and Caucasian students experience college differently (Hawkins, 1999 & Purdy, Eitzen & Hufnagel, 1985), further research is needed to determine the specifics of why it might have been the case for student-athletes in this study.

Student-athletes who participated in non-revenue sports had a strong positive relationship between overall athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college. It is interesting that this was not the case for those student-athletes in revenue producing sports (football, men's basketball and women's basketball). On one hand, it is plausible that student-athletes in revenue producing sports had such an intense focus on their sport that they had not yet developed an identity as a complete student-athlete and viewed themselves more as athletes, leading to having an athletic experience where the satisfaction or dissatisfaction is disconnected from (or not related to) an adjustment to college. On the other hand, student-athletes in this study participating in non-revenue producing sports may have entered college better prepared than the student-athletes in this study participating in revenue producing sports which could have led to them

adjusting positively to college regardless of how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with their athletic experience. For instance, they may have had a more positive adjustment to college simply because they were better students and more prepared than their counterparts in revenue producing sports.

In examining the total athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college by athletic aid status, there was not much difference in the results as both groups showed a significantly positive relationship between the two variables. However, the non-scholarship student-athletes had a slightly stronger relationship in their satisfaction with the athletic experience and adjustment to college. For the non-scholarship student-athletes in this study, it may be inferred that the satisfaction with their athletic experiences may have mattered more for how well they adjusted to college than it did for their peers on scholarship. Then again, the similarities between the overall positive relationship of athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college for both groups may be a positive sign that this university has not created a gap between the experiences of scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes, resulting in a more equal experience for all student-athletes.

Results from Research Question 3

Table 4 shows that Total Athletic Satisfaction had a significantly positive correlation with Academic Adjustment, Social Adjustment, and Attachment to the Institution. Attachment to the institution was the highest area of correlation with total athletic satisfaction which means the satisfaction levels of the athletic experiences of this group of student-athletes did relate positively to a sense or feeling of bond with the

institution including feelings about simply being in college. Therefore, for this group of student-athletes, the athletic experience may absolutely matter in retention since the research shows that attachment to the institution is critical in retention (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1993).

Additionally, it is noteworthy that while there was a broad correlation between the areas of adjustment, not one, in particular, was overwhelmingly driving the entire positive relationship with athletic satisfaction. Again, this is critical in thinking about the experiences of student-athletes holistically. In a departure from the theme of broad positive correlation, personal-emotional adjustment to college was not positively related to overall athletic satisfaction. This is slightly surprising given that one would guess that how satisfied a student-athlete is with his or her athletic experience would almost certainly have a relationship with how well he or she is adjusting to the personal and emotional demands of college with experiences of psychological distress and physical problems. It might be assumed that dissatisfaction would be related to psychological distress but for the student-athletes in this study, that was not the case.

Table 4: Correlations of Total ASQ and SACQ Subscales

	ρ	p-value
Total Adjustment	.450***	.000
Academic Adjustment	.398***	.000
Social Adjustment	.343***	.002
Attachment to the Institution	.451***	.000
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	.172	.138

Results from Research Question 4

As shown in Table 5, all but one of the fifteen subscales of athletic satisfaction were positively correlated broadly. The fact that Ability Utilization did not correlate positively to overall adjustment to college is interesting because this is the facet dealing with how satisfied a student-athlete is with his or her playing time.

Of the other fourteen subscales of athletic satisfaction, the facet most strongly correlated with adjustment to college was the student-athletes' satisfaction with Academic Support. Therefore, academic support matters and the fact that the satisfaction of the academic support offered was shown to be critical in adjustment to college speaks highly of the need for colleges and universities to invest in this component of the holistic student-athlete experience.

Another highly positive relationship emerged between adjustment to college and the Personal Dedication satisfaction subscale. This is an interesting result in that the satisfaction of a student-athlete's own feelings of how he or she contributed to the team related positively to overall adjustment; therefore, satisfaction of personal contributions was a stronger relationship than the relationship of the team's win or loss record or how well the team reached its goals.

Results from Research Question 5

Tables 6.1-6.4 show results from examining research question three by subcategory. Exploring Total Adjustment by gender resulted in a significant positive relationship between Total Adjustment to college and Total Athletic Satisfaction for both male and female student-athletes.

Table 5: Correlations of Total SACQ and ASQ Subscales

	ρ	p-value
Academic Support ASQ	.541***	.000
Personal Dedication ASQ	.525***	.000
Budget	.479***	.000
Team Task Contribution	.423***	.000
Medical Personnel	.398***	.000
Team Integration	.390***	.000
Personal Treatment	.384***	.001
Ethics	.382***	.001
Strategy	.353***	.002
Training and Instruction	.309***	.007
External Agents	.286**	.012
Team Performance	.231**	.045
Team Social Contribution	.227**	.049
Individual Performance	.209*	.070
Ability Utilization	.184	.111

Table 6.1: Correlations of Research Question 3 by Gender

	Total ASQ		Male		Female	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Total Adjustment	.450***	.000	.304*	.051	.557***	.001
Academic Adjustment	.398***	.000	.253	.106	.491***	.003
Social Adjustment	.343***	.002	.229	.145	.408**	.017
Attachment to the Institution	.451***	.000	.409**	.007	.452***	.007
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	.172	.138	.010	.951	.245	.162

Table 6.2: Correlations of Research Question 3 by Ethnicity

	Total ASQ		Caucasian		African American	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Total Adjustment	.450***	.000	.553***	.000	.167	.433
Academic Adjustment	.398***	.000	.418***	.003	.226	.286
Social Adjustment	.343***	.002	.393***	.006	.197	.355
Attachment to the Institution	.451***	.000	.567***	.000	.139	.516
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	.172	.138	.296***	.043	-.082	.702

Table 6.3: Correlations of Research Question 3 by Revenue

	Total ASQ		Revenue		Non-Revenue	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Total Adjustment	.450***	.000	-.117	.634	.618***	.000
Academic Adjustment	.398***	.000	-.145	.553	.509***	.000
Social Adjustment	.343***	.002	.012	.962	.436***	.001
Attachment to the Institution	.451***	.000	-.014	.956	.589***	.000
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	.172	.138	-.177	.468	.254*	.057

Table 6.4: Correlations of Research Question 3 by Athletic Aid Status

	Total ASQ		Scholarship		Non-Scholarship	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Total Adjustment	.450***	.000	.421***	.001	.552**	.017
Academic Adjustment	.398***	.000	.325**	.013	.602***	.008
Social Adjustment	.343***	.002	.282**	.032	.488**	.040
Attachment to the Institution	.451***	.000	.478***	.000	.451*	.061
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	.172	.138	.140	.295	.279	.262

In examining the specific facets of Academic Adjustment and Social Adjustment, male student-athletes in this study showed no significant relationship with Total Athletic Satisfaction while female student-athletes showed a strongly positive correlation with Total Athletic Satisfaction. However, there was a positive relationship for both male and female student-athletes in this study in Total Athletic Satisfaction and Attachment to the Institution. Neither male nor female student-athletes in this study showed a significant relationship between Total Athletic Satisfaction and Personal Emotional Adjustment. In sum, male and female student-athletes in this study had differing experiences with the relationships between specific facets of adjustment to college and total athletic satisfaction.

The broad theme in comparing the experiences of Caucasian and African American student-athletes in this study was that Caucasian student-athletes showed a definite positive relationship between Total Athletic Satisfaction and all areas of adjustment to college while this was not the case for African American student-athletes. For Caucasian student-athletes in this study, the highest levels of relationship with athletic satisfaction occurred in Total Adjustment to college, Academic Adjustment, and Attachment to the Institution. The positive correlations with the satisfaction of their athletic experiences and Social Adjustment and Personal-Emotional Adjustment were indicated at a slightly lower level. While Caucasian student-athletes in this study showed a positive correlation between athletic satisfaction and all areas of adjustment to college, the African American student-athletes in this study showed no correlation between athletic satisfaction and any of the areas of adjustment to college. Therefore, as is

evidenced in the literature, there is no question that the African American and Caucasian student-athletes in this study experienced being a student-athlete differently.

Similar to the results when controlling by ethnicity, the results of examining the relationship between athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college differs nearly completely for student-athletes in this study participating in revenue producing versus non-revenue producing sports. In this case, the student-athletes in this study in revenue producing sports were found to have no significant correlation between the satisfaction with their athletic experiences and their adjustment to college. For the student-athletes in this study participating in non-revenue producing sports, there was a positive relationship between the satisfaction with their athletic experiences and Total Adjustment to college, Academic Adjustment to college, Social Adjustment to college, Attachment to the Institution, and Personal-Emotional Adjustment. For those student-athletes in non-revenue producing sports, how satisfied they were with their athletic experience certainly had a correlation with their overall adjustment experience as a student-athlete and seems to have been more important for them than the athletic satisfaction of those student-athletes in revenue producing sports. Again, it is thought that student-athletes in revenue producing sports and student-athletes in non-revenue producing sports experience college differently and that was indeed the case with regard to athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college for the student-athletes in this study.

In examining all of the controlling variables of this study, athletic aid status was the variable that had the least impact on differing experiences of student-athletes. In this study, both scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes showed positive correlations

between Athletic Satisfaction and Total Adjustment to college, Academic Adjustment to college, Social Adjustment to college, and Attachment to the Institution. This, again, may be something that is specific to this university where an attempt may have been made to provide an equal experience to scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes.

Results from Research Question 6

Tables 7.1-7.4 show full results from the data analysis of research question six. In examining results by gender, for both male and female student-athletes in this study, the highest area of positive relationship between Total Adjustment to college and satisfaction with their athletic experiences was found in their satisfaction with Academic Support Services. There are absolutely areas of differences between males and females in this study including the satisfaction with the Ethics which includes feelings of satisfaction with ethical positions of teammates. For female student-athletes in this study, their satisfaction with the ethical positions of teammates was positively related to the overall adjustment to college while this was not the case for male student-athletes in this study. Another area of distinction was in the athletic satisfaction facet of Personal Treatment. Female student-athletes in this study were found to have a positive relationship between Personal Treatment from the coach and Adjustment to College whereas treatment from the coach was not a significant relationship in the adjustment of the male student-athletes in this study.

For African American student-athletes in this study, the only two positive relationships between Total Adjustment to college and the fifteen facets of athletic satisfaction were satisfaction with Academic Support Services and satisfaction with

Table 7.1: Correlations of Research Question 4 by Gender

	Total SACQ		Male		Female	
	ρ	P-value	ρ	P-value	ρ	P-value
Academic Support ASQ	.541***	.000	.456***	.002	.587***	.000
Personal Dedication ASQ	.525***	.000	.422***	.005	.558**	.001
Budget	.479***	.000	.420***	.006	.443***	.009
Team Task Contribution	.423***	.000	.327**	.035	.487***	.004
Medical Personnel	.398***	.000	.361**	.019	.355**	.040
Team Integration	.390***	.000	.332**	.031	.417**	.014
Personal Treatment	.384***	.001	.186	.237	.494***	.003
Ethics	.382***	.001	.140	.377	.578***	.000
Strategy	.353***	.002	.158	.317	.444***	.009
Training and Instruction	.309***	.007	.202	.199	.353**	.041
External Agents	.286**	.012	.221	.161	.321*	.064
Team Performance	.231**	.045	-.151	.339	.544***	.001
Team Social Contribution	.227**	.049	.224	.153	.232	.186
Individual Performance	.209*	.070	.089	.574	.176	.319
Ability Utilization	.184	.111	.186	.238	.286	.126

Medical Personnel. For Caucasian student-athletes, the highest area of positive relationship between the areas of athletic satisfaction and Total Adjustment to college also was shown in the facet of satisfaction with Academic Support Services. For the students in this study, satisfaction with academic support services has the strongest relationship with adjustment to college compared to all other satisfaction areas within the athletic experience. Again, the data from the student-athletes in this study show the importance of satisfaction with academic support services in relation to these

Table 7.2: Correlations of Research Question 4 by Ethnicity

	Total SACQ		Caucasian		African American	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Academic Support ASQ	.541***	.000	.565***	.000	.494**	.014
Personal Dedication ASQ	.525***	.000	.577***	.000	.227	.286
Budget	.479***	.000	.414***	.003	.341	.102
Team Task Contribution	.423***	.000	.488***	.000	.299	.155
Medical Personnel	.398***	.000	.362**	.012	.431**	.035
Team Integration	.390***	.000	.492***	.000	-.013	.950
Personal Treatment	.384***	.001	.488***	.000	.072	.737
Ethics	.382***	.001	.439***	.001	.223	.293
Strategy	.353***	.002	.452***	.001	.059	.783
Training and Instruction	.309***	.007	.430***	.002	.072	.737
External Agents	.286**	.012	.385***	.007	.035	.868
Team Performance	.231**	.045	.370***	.010	-.038	.858
Team Social Contribution	.227**	.049	.334**	.021	.087	.686
Individual Performance	.209*	.070	.370***	.010	-.038	.858
Ability Utilization	.184	.111	.338**	.020	-.199	.351

student-athletes' adjustment to college experiences while also showing that the two groups of student-athletes experience being a student-athlete differently.

The student-athletes participating in revenue producing sports had no significantly positive relationship between Total Adjustment to college and any of the fifteen facets of athletic satisfaction. The student-athletes participating in non-revenue producing sports had a positive relationship with all facets of athletic satisfaction and total adjustment to college. For the student-athletes in non-revenue producing sports, the most positive relationship with Total Adjustment to college was found in satisfaction with Academic Support Services, followed by satisfaction with Personal Dedication.

Table 7.3: Correlations of Research Question 4 by Revenue

	Total SACQ		Revenue		Non-Revenue	
	ρ	P-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Academic Support ASQ	.541***	.000	.242	.316	.618***	.000
Personal Dedication ASQ	.525***	.000	.154	.529	.610***	.000
Budget	.479***	.000	.356	.134	.504***	.000
Team Task Contribution	.423***	.000	-.048	.845	.558***	.000
Medical Personnel	.398***	.000	-.118	.629	.503***	.000
Team Integration	.390***	.000	-.161	.509	.533***	.000
Personal Treatment	.384***	.001	-.091	.709	.496***	.000
Ethics	.382***	.001	.046	.851	.501***	.000
Strategy	.353***	.002	-.111	.649	.472***	.000
Training and Instruction	.309***	.007	-.168	.490	.476***	.000
External Agents	.286**	.012	.340	.153	.358***	.006
Team Performance	.231**	.045	-.426*	.068	.433***	.001
Team Social Contribution	.227**	.049	-.034	.887	.340***	.010
Individual Performance	.209*	.070	-.434*	.063	.400***	.002
Ability Utilization	.184	.111	-.449*	.053	.424***	.001

Interestingly, the student-athletes in this study in non-revenue producing sports were found to have a positive relationship between their adjustment to college and their satisfaction with the team's budget. This may mean that feeling supported and valued financially by the institution may have been important for the student-athletes participating in non-revenue producing sports in this study.

Table 7.4: Correlations of Research Question 4 by Athletic Aid Status

	Total SACQ		Scholarship		Non-Scholarship	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Academic Support ASQ	.541***	.000	.552***	.000	.504**	.033
Personal Dedication ASQ	.525***	.000	.562***	.000	.414*	.088
Budget	.479***	.000	.530***	.000	.368	.132
Team Task Contribution	.423***	.000	.383***	.003	.557**	.016
Medical Personnel	.398***	.000	.376***	.004	.402*	.099
Team Integration	.390***	.000	.380***	.003	.520**	.027
Personal Treatment	.384***	.001	.382***	.003	.448*	.063
Ethics	.382***	.001	.282**	.032	.639***	.004
Strategy	.353***	.002	.258**	.050	.497**	.036
Training and Instruction	.309***	.007	.179	.202	.634***	.005
External Agents	.286**	.012	.332**	.011	.110	.664
Team Performance	.231**	.045	.101	.452	.566**	.014
Team Social Contribution	.227**	.049	.059	.661	.587***	.010
Individual Performance	.209*	.070	.130	.330	.437*	.070
Ability Utilization	.184	.111	.127	.344	.395	.105

For both the scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes, the facet of athletic satisfaction that related most strongly and positively to Total Adjustment to the institution was, again, satisfaction with Academic Support Services. Even though the results from the data analysis show that scholarship student-athletes and non-scholarship student-athletes have different relationships with athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college, the common thread continues to be that satisfaction with Academic Support Services matters. The theme is clear, regardless of student-athlete and regardless of how the data

are split, satisfaction with Academic Support Services was important in the relationship of adjusting to college for student-athletes in this study.

Additionally, for both scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes, satisfaction with Team Integration and Personal Dedication had positive relationships with Total Adjustment to college; therefore, regardless of athletic aid status, the more positively satisfied all student-athletes in this study felt about the teams' coordinated efforts toward the same goal and their personal dedication of contributing toward the team, the more positive the adjustment to college. In contrast, scholarship student-athletes were found to have no significant relationship between satisfaction with the training and instruction they received from coaches while this was a positive factor for non-scholarship student-athletes.

Chapter 5

Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following chapter details the discussion and conclusions from the data analysis and results in Chapters 3 and 4 and includes implications for practitioners and administrators. Following the discussion and conclusions, recommendations for future research are outlined and discussed.

Conclusions

This study was conducted as an examination to determine if any relationship existed between a student-athlete's satisfaction with their athletic experiences and their adjustment to college in an attempt to better understand the holistic experience of first-year student-athletes. To be clear, the scope of this study did not include an examination of the significance of what was good or bad regarding adjustment to college and athletic satisfaction scores; instead, the scope of this study examined the basis of whether or not a relationship existed.

Overall, the finding indicated a relationship did exist between the areas of athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college ($p = .450$); therefore, these findings suggest that the experience of a student-athlete cannot be compartmentalized and offer evidence that the academic, athletic and social experiences of a student-athlete are interconnected. While the sample from this study is not one from which results can be generalized to a larger population, the findings are certainly strong enough to give weight to the importance of future research in order to assist in closing the gap in existing literature of how satisfaction with the athletic experience relates to the adjustment to college for first-year

student-athletes. As previous research indicated (Settles, Sellers, & Drama, 2002; Adler & Adler, 1991), the finding that a positive relationship existed between athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college supports the need for student-athletes to understand and balance being both a student and athlete in order to be successful.

The major takeaway for academic support services personnel is that regardless of how the data are split and regardless of the specific subcategory of student-athlete, satisfaction with academic support services is among the highest area of positive correlation with these student-athletes' adjustments to college. While this may have been a belief of personnel working in the academic support services area, the data from this group of student-athletes does highlight the importance of academic support. As found by Kennedy (2007) and Sailes & Harrison (2008), this finding supports and expands on other work that has shown the significance of appropriate academic support programs for student-athletes.

For university and athletics administrators, this finding should not be taken lightly; instead, it should be seen as an opportunity to look intently at athletic academic support on each campus. Are the resources in place for student-athletes to be satisfied with the support they are receiving? Can anything be improved in the area to ensure the student-athletes feel satisfied? Clearly, this study does not provide all of the answers, but it does lend credibility to allow administrators to spend the time, effort and resources to look further into academic support services on each college campus. The findings from this study should certainly contribute to institutional expectations and an understanding

from athletic administrators and coaches that the academic experience is tied directly to the athletic experience and vice versa.

In examining all student-athletes, it is an important finding that the strongest area of adjustment related to athletic satisfaction is within attachment to the institution ($p = .451$). As first-year retention rates are important for institutions, they are just as critically important from athletics in graduation and academic success rates from the NCAA, athletic satisfaction appears to be an extremely important factor to retain first-year student-athletes.

Research has found that students who withdraw often do so for personal reasons such as lack of adjustment to the college environment (Kalsner & Pistole, 2003; Kerr, Johnson, Gans, & Krumrine, 2004) and adjustment during a student's first year may play a pivotal role in predicting college completion (Grant-Vallone, Reid, Umali, & Pohlert, 2004; Tinto, 1993). Therefore, the finding that athletic satisfaction related strongly to attachment to the institution might link athletic satisfaction directly to retention. As administrators continue to undertake the challenge of improving retention rates, it might be inferred that based on the findings of this study, the athletic satisfaction of student-athletes should be examined closely in an effort to improve retention rates of that group of students.

In most instances, the results of this study affirmed that the subgroups of student-athletes in this study did experience the adjustment to college differently. This is particularly interesting in comparing the results of men versus women. While the male student-athletes had a positive relationship between adjustment to college and athletic

satisfaction ($\rho = .304$), the relationship for the female student-athletes was much stronger ($\rho = .557$). Additionally, female student-athletes were shown to have a positive relationship between total athletic satisfaction and academic adjustment ($\rho = .491$) and social adjustment ($\rho = .408$) and total adjustment to college and ethics ($\rho = .578$) and personal treatment ($\rho = .494$). This may point back to the literature and be explained by female students being more prepared for college while having a better understanding of their student identity than their male counterparts (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1993). In general, women have been found to be more satisfied with their academic experiences than men and women have been found to have higher GPA's/academic achievement which has been found to correlate with greater levels of academic satisfaction (Benjamin & Hollings, 1997; Pennington, Zvonkovic, & Wilson, 1989). Also, female student-athletes have reported experiencing less of a role-conflict between student and athlete than their male counterparts (Sack & Thiel, 1985) which may, in part, be due to fewer opportunities to play their sport professionally after graduation than men (Coakley, 2007). Therefore, the results from this study may support the literature in that women experienced a stronger connection to their academic experiences and adjustment than did the males.

An interesting result is shown in that personal treatment from the coach is positively related to adjustment for female student-athletes ($\rho = .494$) but this is not the case for male student-athletes. One potential explanation of this result may be in the link to the differences in the importance of relationships for men and women in adjustment to college. Women tend to rely on relationships and socializations experiences to aid in

adjustment to college more than their male peers (Kenny & Rice, 1995) which may point toward the importance of how treatment from the coach matters more in the adjustment process for women. Additionally, in other studies it has been found that female student-athletes perform better than male student-athletes when receiving constructive feedback (Smith, Fry, Ethington, & Li, 2005), and that among female student-athletes, there is a positive correlation between perceptions of a coaches' behavior and satisfaction (Allen & Howe, 1998). Therefore, the referenced research may assist in contextualizing the result that treatment from the coach relating positively for female student-athletes. It also may be a point of reference in looking further at the coaching philosophies of player treatment toward both male and female student-athletes. The difference in experiences reiterates that administrators should be looking very carefully at the specific experiences of male and female student-athletes on their campuses.

Another finding from the study that varied by gender was in the relationship between satisfaction with ethics and adjustment to college. For female student-athletes, satisfaction with ethical positions of teammates was strongly positively related to adjustment to college ($p = .578$) while this finding was not significant for male student-athletes. While gender differences in ethics of college student-athletes is not well documented, this finding supports the literature surrounding college students that women tend to hold themselves to higher moral standards while men tend to be socialized to be accepting of and willing to cheat more often than women (Franke, Crown, & Spake, 1997; Kristiansen & Hotte, 1996; Whitley, Nelson, & Jones, 1999). Athletic administrators should take heed in this finding as educating student-athletes and coaches

regarding ethical expectations should be at the forefront of many discussions. As shown as a finding of this study, a focus of that discussion should be geared toward male student-athletes.

The difference shown in the experiences of African American and Caucasian student-athletes is another noteworthy finding. The fact that African American student-athletes in this study were not found to have a significant relationship between overall adjustment to college and overall satisfaction with the athletic experience is something that should be further explored. As previous research indicates, African American student-athletes may have more difficulty than their Caucasian peers in maintaining the student identity during the collegiate athletic experience (Adler & Adler, 1991; Hawkins, 1999). Further, based on the differing experiences of Caucasian and African American student-athletes in this study, it might be concluded that the African American student-athletes experienced a lack of a connection between their athletic and academic experiences. It is entirely possible that the African American student-athletes in this study were experiencing stereotype threat and feelings of the “dumb jock” stereotype that suggests African American student-athletes have limited intellectual abilities, lack motivation, and do not perform well academically (Harrison, 1998; Lapchick, 1996; Simons, et al., 2007).

The findings from this study have confirmed that there is a difference in how African American and Caucasian student-athletes experience being a student-athlete. As a practitioner, it is valuable to view these findings in an attempt to understand how African American student-athletes may experience college. As researchers have

suggested, academic counselors and coaches should advise transitioning first-year student-athletes to cultivate relationships on campus to engage academically (Howard-Hamilton & Sina, 2001; Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Comeaux et al., 2011), and they should, in working with African American student-athletes, reaffirm a positive connection to their academic and scholastic identities in order to combat stereotype threat of them being labeled as a “dumb jock” (Stone, Harrison, & Mottley, 2012).

However, in breaking down the areas of athletic satisfaction, African American student-athletes were found to have positive relationships with adjustment to college with academic support services ($\rho = .494$) and medical personnel ($\rho = .431$). Therefore, satisfaction with academic support services and medical support personnel were the only areas where African American and Caucasian student-athletes were both found to have positive relationships with adjustment to college. This is an interesting finding in that it connects to previous research highlighting the importance of forming relationships with faculty and staff (Astin, 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991), in particular, for African American students on predominantly White campuses (Braddock, 1981; Guiffrida & Douthit, 2010). Based on this finding and the literature, an emphasis for student services personnel while working with African American student-athletes should be on forming positive relationships to allow these students to feel connected and satisfied relating to a more strongly positive adjustment to college.

In all areas outside of satisfaction with academic support services and medical personnel, African American and Caucasian student-athletes experienced the relationship between athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college differently. While this finding

may present challenges for administrators and athletic support personnel, it sheds light on two aspects: first, that satisfaction with academic support is critical for all student-athletes regardless of ethnicity; second, that in most areas of the athletic and academic experience, ethnicity is a factor to consider when examining the experiences of first-year student-athletes.

Similar to examining the experiences of student-athletes by ethnicity, a deeper examination into the experience of student-athletes in revenue producing and non-revenue producing sports are warranted. Results from this study indicate differing experiences for student-athletes based on participation in revenue or non-revenue sport and this could be important for administrators and academic support personnel if charged with ensuring student-athletes are having similar academic and athletic experiences regardless of which sport is played. The results may have implications that academic support personnel should be cognizant of the differing experiences in programming and support in that the needs of student-athletes in revenue and non-revenue producing sports may be different. To that end, as administrators are developing content for transition programs for first-year student-athletes, it will be important to educate student-athletes regarding the relationship between their academic and athletic experiences.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study should be noted. The sample was drawn from a single institution; therefore, the ability to generalize the results to other institutions and student-athletes is limited. While every precaution was taken to ensure that the study was conducted in a way to minimize any effect, it is entirely possible that the participants

answered more favorably regarding the satisfaction with academic support services due to the fact that the student-athletes' academic counselors administered the surveys.

Another limitation was in the basic statistical measures used in the study. Because the researcher was examining the data for basic correlations, high and low scores for athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college are not known. Instead, it is only known that a relationship between the variables either existed or did not exist.

In regards to the results of research questions by ethnicity and type of sport, it is possible that the similarities of the findings of African American student-athletes and revenue student-athletes are due to the potential that the revenue student-athletes could have all also been African American. There were a total of 24 African American student-athletes that participated in the study and a total of 19 student-athletes in revenue producing sports. It is not known how many of the 19 student-athletes in revenue producing sports were African American; therefore, it is entirely possible that all 19 student-athletes in revenue producing sports were African American.

Finally, it should be noted that the sample consisted of approximately 60% of the first-year cohort of student-athletes at this institution and the participants did not self-select. All student-athletes who were asked to complete the survey did, in fact, complete the survey. The approximately 40% of the cohort not surveyed was the result of the failure of the academic counselors that resulting in not presenting those student-athletes with the opportunity to participate in the survey. Therefore, the risk for bias of more highly satisfied students self-selecting was minimal.

Recommendations for Further Research

The first recommendation for further research is to replicate the study more broadly by surveying student-athletes at other NCAA Division I institutions both in the Southeastern Conference and elsewhere. This is the first step to determine if the findings remain true and if they might be able to be generalized more broadly to the student-athlete experience. If it is the case that the findings are consistent with findings at other institutions, it would offer the initial foundation for a framework by which to view the relationship of athletic satisfaction and the adjustment to college experiences of student-athletes at the Division I level. With consistent findings across multiple samples, it could be a foundation by which the NCAA could study the differing experience of student-athletes including how different subgroups of student-athlete experience the adjustment to college differently and similarly. Further research could shape future academic legislation regarding academic support services requirements and athletic benchmarks to be required at each member institution.

Another recommendation is to examine the data in both this study and future studies with more in-depth statistical measures. While this study examined the data using simple correlation procedures to determine if a relationship between the two areas existed, using a more complicated regression analysis in the methods and procedures would allow the findings to be conclusive of causality and prediction amongst the variables. Additionally, with t-tests or a regression analysis, future research would allow a deeper look at how high and low scores in specific areas of athletic satisfaction have a correlation and causality with high and low scores in specific areas of adjustment to college. This would allow researchers and practitioners to examine specific areas within

athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college to determine which areas are most critical and predictive of academic success for student-athletes within each subgroup.

Additionally, in future research it is recommended to examine the experiences of athletic satisfaction and adjustment to college qualitatively to determine why student-athletes responded the way they did. In particular, it would be interesting to qualitatively determine why African American student-athletes had a positive relationship with adjusting to college and satisfaction with academic support services and medical personnel but no other areas? What reasoning and rationale might be behind the relationships of adjustment to college and athletic satisfaction by ethnicity that we cannot glean by only examining numerical data?

List of References

- Adler, P. A. & Adler, P. (1991). *Backboards & blackboards: College athletes and role engulfment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Allen, J., & Howe, B. (1998). Player ability, coach feedback, and female adolescent athletes perceived competence and satisfaction. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20, 280-289.
- Andrade, M. S. (2006). A first-year seminar for international students. *Journal of the First-year Experience and Students in Transition*, 18(1), 85-103.
- Athiyaman, A. (1997). Linking student satisfaction and service quality perceptions: The case of university education. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(7), 528-540.
- Asberg, K. K., Bowers, C., Renk, K., & McKinney, C. (2008). A structural equation modeling approach to the study of stress and psychological adjustment in emerging adults. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 39, 481-501.
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 587-598.
- Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1999). *Student adaptation to college questionnaire manual* (2nd printing). Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1986). Exploratory intervention with a scale measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 33(1), 31-38
- Baker, R. W., McNeil, O. V., & Siryk, B. (1985). Expectation and reality in freshman adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32(1), 94-103.
- Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(2), 179-189.

- Bean, J. P., & Bradley, R. K. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 393-412.
- Benjamin, M., & Hollings, A. E. (1997). Student satisfaction: Test of an ecological model. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38 (3), 213-228.
- Bimper, A. Y., & Harrison, L. (2011). Meet me at the crossroads: African American athletic and racial identity. *Quest*, 63, 275-288.
- Bolton, R. N., Kannan, P. K., Bramlett, M. D. (2000). Implications of loyalty program membership and service experiences for customer retention and value. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1), 95-108.
- Braddock, J. (1981). Desegregation and Black student attrition. *Urban Education*, 15, 403-418.
- Bruening, J. E., Armstrong, K. L., & Pastore, D. L. (2005). Listening to the voices: The experiences of African American female student athletes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 76(1), 82-100.
- Buote, V., Pancer S., Pratt M., et al. (2007) The importance of friends: Friendship and adjustment among 1-year university students. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22(6), 665–689.
- Burns, G. N., Jasinski, D., Dunn, S., & Fletcher, D. (2013). Academic support services and career decision-making self-efficacy in student athletes. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 62, 161-167.
- Chelladurai, P. (1980). Leadership in sports organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 5, 226-231.

- Chelladurai, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6(1), 27-41.
- Chelladurai, P. & Carron, A. V. (1978). *Leadership*, Ottawa: Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. (Monograph).
- Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1997). A classification of facets of athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 133-159.
- Chu, D., Segrave, J. O., & Becker, B. J. (1985). *Sport and higher education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Clotfelter, C. (2013). *Big-time sports in American universities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coakley, J. (2007). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (9th ed.). New York:: McGraw-Hill.
- Coladarci, T., Cobb, C. D., Minium, E. W., & Clarke, R. C. (2008). *Fundamentals of statistical reasoning in education* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Comeaux, E. (2011). A study of attitudes toward college student-athletes: Implications for faculty-athletics engagement. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 80(4), 521-532.
- Comeaux, E., & Harrison, C. K. (2011). A conceptual model of academic success for student-athletes. *Educational Researcher*, 40(5), 235-245.

- Comeaux, E., Speer, L., Taustine, M., Harrison, C. K. (2011). Purposeful engagement of first-year Division I student-athletes. *Journal of The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 23(1), 35-52.
- Compas, B. E., Wagner, B. M., Slavin, L. A., & Vannatta, K. (1986). A perspective study of life events, social support, and psychological symptomatology during the transition from high school to college. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14, 241-257.
- Courneya, K. S., & Chelladurai, P. (1991). A model of performance measures in baseball. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-45.
- Czopp, A. M. (2010). Studying is lame when he got game: Racial stereotypes and the discouragement of Black student-athletes from schoolwork. *Social Psychology of Education*, 13(4), 485-498.
- Dahmus, S., & Bernardin, H. (1992). Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, 25(3), 139-142.
- Deaner, R. G. (2009). Female student-athletes: Counseling considerations for a unique culture. In Kissinger, D. B. & Miller, M. T. (Eds.), *College student-athletes: Challenges ,opportunities, and policy implications* (133-149). Information Age Publishing. Available from:
<http://proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/login?url=site.ebrary.com/lib/utennk/Doc?id=1042963>
- Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

- Estler, S., & Nelson, L. (2005). *Who calls the shots? Sports and university leadership, culture, and decision making. ASHE higher education report, 30(5)*. ASHE Higher Education Report.
- Eys, M. A., Carron, A. V., Bray, S. R., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2003). Role ambiguity and athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Sciences, 21*, 391-401.
- Feldt, R. C., Graham, M., & Dew, D. (2011). Measuring adjustment to college: Construct validity of the student adaptation to college questionnaire. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 44(2)*, 92-104.
- Flower, J. A. (2003). *Downstairs, upstairs: The changed spirit and face of college life in America*. Akron, OH: The University of Akron Press.
- Franke, G. R., Crown, D. F., & Spake, D. F. (1997). Gender differences in ethical perceptions of business practices: A social role theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 920-934.
- Frey, J. H. (1982). *The governance of intercollegiate athletics*. West Point, NY: Leisure Press.
- Gaston-Gayles, J. L. (2004). Examining academic and athletic motivation among student-athletes at a Division I university. *Journal of College Student Development, 45(1)*, 75-83.
- Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*, 281-288.

- Graham, C., Baker, R. W., & Wapner, S. (1985). Prior interracial experience and Black student transition into predominantly White colleges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(5), 1146-1154.
- Grant-Vallone, E., Reid, K., Umali, C., & Pohlert, E. (2004). An analysis of the effects of self-esteem, social support, and participation in student support services on students' adjustment and commitment to college. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 5(3), 255-274.
- Gerdy, J. R. (1997). *The successful college athletic program: The new standard*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.
- Glass, C.R., Gomez, E., Urzua, A. (2014). Recreation, intercultural friendship, and international students' adaptation to college by region of origin. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 42, 104-117.
- Guiffrida, D. A., & Douthit, K. Z. (2010). The Black student experience at predominantly White college: Implications for school and college counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 88(3), 311-318.
- Harmon, N. (2010). Overscheduled and overcommitted: The lives of student athletes. *About Campus*, January-February, 26-29.
- Harrison, C. K. (1998). Themes that thread through society: Racism and athletic manifestation in the African American community. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 1(1), 63-74.

- Hawkins, B. (1999). Black student athletes at predominantly white national collegiate athletic association (NCAA) Division I institutions and the pattern of oscillating migrant laborers. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 21(1), 1-9.
- Hawkins, B. (2010). *The new plantation: Black athletes, college sports, and predominantly white NCAA institutions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F, & Sina, J. A. (2001). How college affects student athletes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 35-45.
- Hyatt, R. (2003). Barrier to persistence among African American intercollegiate athletes: A literature review of non-cognitive variables. *College Student Journal*, 37(2), 260-275.
- Kalsner, L., & Pistole, M. C. (2003). College adjustment in a multiethnic sample: Attachment, separation-individuation, and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 92-109.
- Kennedy, R. D. (2007). *A historical study of the development of the total person program: The evolution of academic support services for student-athletes at the University of Missouri* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri at Columbia.
- Kenny, M. E., & Rice, K. (1995). Attachment to parents and adjustment in late adolescent college students: Current status, applications, and future considerations. *The Counseling Psychologists*, 23, 433-456.

- Kerr, S., Johnson, V. K., Gans, S. E., & Krumrine, J. (2004). Predicting adjustment during the transition to college: Alexithymia, perceived stress, and psychological symptoms. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 593-611.
- Kovtun, O. (2011). International student adaptation to a U.S. college: A mixed methods exploration of the impact of a specialized first-year course at a large Midwestern institution. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 42*(3), 349-366.
- Kristiansen, C. M., & Hotte, A. M. (1996). Morality and the self: Implications for the when and how of value-attitude-behavior relations. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, L. & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values* (77-105). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lapchick, R. (1996). *Sport in society: Equal opportunity or business as usual*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lent, R. W. (2004). Toward a unifying theoretical and practical perspective on well-being and psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 482-509.
- Lubker, J. R. & Etzel, E. F. (2007). College adjustment experiences of first-year students: Disengaged athletes, nonathletes, and current varsity athletes. *NASPA Journal, 44*(3), 457-480.
- Mattanah, J. F., Hancock, G. R., & Brand, B. L. (2004). Parental attachment, separation-individuation, and college student adjustment: A structural equation analysis of mediational effects. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 213-225.
- McAllister, M. (1998). College bowl sponsorship and the increased commercialization of amateur sports. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 15*(4), 357-381.

- McDonald, S. D., & Vrana, S. R. (2007). Interracial social comfort and its relationship to adjustment to college. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 76(2), 130-140.
- Melendez, M. C., & Melendez, N. B. (2010). The influence of parental attachment on the college adjustment of White, Black, and Latina/Hispanic women: A cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(4), 419-435.
- Mori, S. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78(2), 137-144.
- Nixon, H. L. (2014). *The athletic trap: How college sports corrupted the academy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., Bohr, L., Nora, A., & Terenzini, P. T. (1995). Intercollegiate athletic participation and freshman-year cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 369-397.
- Pascarella, E. T., Truckenmiller, R., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., Edison, M. & Hagedorn, L. S. (1999). Cognitive impacts of intercollegiate athletic participation: Some further evidence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 1-26.
- Pennington, D. C., Zvonkovic, A. M., & Wilson, S. L. (1989). Changes in college satisfaction across an academic term. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 528-535.

- Phillips, J. J. (2007). *An investigation of the relationship between academic and athletic satisfaction among division IA student-athletes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from University Electronic Library (Thesis 2007b.P478). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Pritchard, M. E., Wilson, G. S., & Yamnitz, B. (2007). What predicts adjustment among college students? A longitudinal panel study. *Journal of American College Health*, 56, 15-21.
- Purdy, D. A., Eitzen, D. S., & Hufnagel, R. (1985). Are athletes also students? The educational attainment of college athletes. In D. Chu, J. O., Segrave, & B. J. Becker (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (221-234). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Reynolds, L., Fisher, D., & Cavil, J. K. (2012). Impact of demographic variables on African-American student athletes' academic performance. *Educational Foundations*, Summer-Fall, 93-111.
- Riemer, H., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 20(2), 127-156.
- Riemer, H. & Chelladurai, P. (2002). *Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire manual*. Retrieved from: <http://www.uregina.ca/kinesiology/ASQ>.
- Sack, A. L., & Thiel, R. (1985). College basketball and role conflict: A national survey. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2, 195-209.
- Sack, A., & Staurowsky, E. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Sailes, G., & Harrison, L. (2008). *Social Issues in sports*. In A. Leslie-Toogood & E. Gill (Eds.), *Advising student-athletes: A comprehensive approach to success* (13-21). Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Adams-Gaston, J. (1992). Predicting the academic successes of student-athletes using SAT and noncognitive variables. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 724-727.
- Sellers, R., Kupermine, G., & Dames, A. (1997). The college life experiences of African American women athletes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 25, 699-720.
- Settles, I. H., Sellers, R. M., & Damas, A. (2002). One role or two? The function of psychological separation in role conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 547-582.
- Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simmons, H. D., Van Rheenen, D., & Covington, M. V. (1999). Academic motivation and the student athlete. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 151-162.
- Simons, H., Bosworth, C., Fujita, S., & Jensen, M. (2007). The Athlete Stigma in Higher Education. *College Student Journal*, 41(2), 251-273.
- Smith, P. C., Kendal, L. M., & Hulin, C. C. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Smith, R. A. (2011). *Pay for play: A history of big-time college athletic reform*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Smith, R. A. (1988). *Sports and freedom: The rise of big-time college athletics*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, S., Fry, M., Ethington, C., & Li, Y. (2005). The effect of female athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors on their perceptions of the motivational climate. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 17*, 170-177.
- Stone, J., Harrison, C. K., & Mottley, J. (2012). "Don't call me a student-athlete": The effect of identity priming on stereotype threat for academically engaged African American college athletes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 34*(2), 99-106.
- Stripling, J. (2014, October 23). Widespread nature of Chapel Hill's academic fraud is laid bare. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Widespread-Nature-of-Chapel/149603/>.
- Swenson, L. M., Nordstrom, A., & Hiester, M. (2008). The role of peer relationships in adjustment to college. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(6), 551-567.
- Sullivan, P. J., & Gee, C. J. (2007). The relationship between athletic satisfaction and intrateam communication. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 11*(2), 107-116.
- Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (1977). Voluntary freshman attrition and patterns of social and academic integration in a university: A test of a conceptual model. *Research in Higher Education, 6*, 25-43.

- Ting, S. M. R. (2009). Impact of noncognitive factors on first-year academic performance and persistence of NCAA Division I student athletes. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 48, 215-228.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Watt, S. K., & Moore, J. L. (2001). Who are student athletes? *Student Services for Athletes*. 93, 7-18.
- Wei, M., Russell, D. W., & Zakalik, R. A. (2005). Adult attachment, social self-efficacy, self-disclosure, loneliness, and subsequent depression for freshman college students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 602-614.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, C. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.
- Whitley, B. E., Nelson, A. B., & Jones, C. J. (1999). Gender differences in cheating attitudes and classroom behavior: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 41(9), 657-680.
- Whittal, N. R., & Orlick, T. D. (1978). The sport satisfaction inventory. In G. C. Roberts & K. M. Newll (Eds.), *Psychology of motor behavior and sport* (144-155), Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire

Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ)

Robert W. Rains, PhD and Jordan S. Gray, M.A.

Division of
WESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES
15001 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90049-1171
Telephone: (310) 206-1171

Directions

Please print the identifying information requested on the right.

The 67 statements on the front and back of this form assess the college experience. Read each one and decide how well it applies to you at the present time (within the past few days). For each statement, circle the response at the point in the continuum that best represents how closely the statement applies to you. Circle only one response for each statement. To change an answer, draw an X through the incorrect response and circle the desired response. Be sure to use a hard-tipped pen or pencil and press very firmly. Do not erase.

Name: _____ Date: _____
ID Number: _____ Sex: ☐ F ☐ M Date of Birth: _____
Current Academic Standing: ☐ Freshman ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior
Semester: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ Summer or Quarter: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ Summer
Ethnic Background (optional): ☐ Asian ☐ Black ☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American ☐ White ☐ Other

In the example on the right, Item A applied very closely, and Item B was changed from "doesn't apply at all" to "no idea sometimes."

Example
A. ☒ 5 * * * * *
B. * * * ☒ 2 * * *

Applies Very
Closely to Me

Doesn't Apply
to Me at All

1. I feel that I fit in well as part of the college environment.
2. I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.
3. I have been keeping up to date on my academic work.
4. I am meeting as many people and making as many friends as I would like at college.
5. I know why I'm in college and what I want out of it.
6. I am finding academic work at college difficult.
7. Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.
8. I am very involved with social activities in college.
9. I am adjusting well to college.
10. I have not been functioning well during examinations.
11. I have felt tired much of the time lately.
12. Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.
13. I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.
14. I have had informal, personal contacts with college professors.
15. I am pleased now about my decision to go to college.
16. I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.
17. I'm not working as hard as I should at my course work.
18. I have several close social ties at college.
19. My academic goals and purposes are well defined.
20. I haven't been able to control my emotions very well lately.
21. I'm not really smart enough for the academic work I am expected to be doing now.
22. Homesickness for home is a source of difficulty for me now.
23. Getting a college degree is very important to me.
24. My appetite has been good lately.
25. I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.
26. I enjoy living in a college dormitory. (Please omit if you do not live in a dormitory; any university housing should be regarded as a dormitory.)
27. I enjoy writing papers for courses.
28. I have been having a lot of headaches lately.
29. I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.
30. I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available at college.
31. I've given a lot of thought lately to whether I should ask for help from the Psychological Counseling Services Center or from a psychotherapist outside of college.
32. Lately I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education.
33. I am getting along very well with my roommate(s) at college.

(Please omit if you do not have a roommate.)

PLEASE TURN THE FORM OVER NOW AND COMPLETE STATEMENTS 34 THROUGH 67.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: This copy is produced from WPS Form 100-1, 4-75 (P2) REV. 10-7-78, 15001 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 200, Los Angeles, CA 90049-1171.

Copyright © 1985 by WESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

No other copy or reproduction of this questionnaire is permitted without the written permission of Western Psychological Services.

W-228A

5-7-8-5

WPS Form 100-1

SACQ Page 2

	Applies Very Closely to Me	Doesn't Apply to Me at All
34. I wish I were at another college or university.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
35. I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
36. I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
37. I feel that I have enough social skills to get along well in the college setting.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
38. I have been getting angry too easily lately.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
39. Recently I have had trouble concentrating when I try to study.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
40. I haven't been sleeping very well.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
41. I am not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
42. I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
43. I am satisfied with the quality or the caliber of courses available at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
44. I am attending classes regularly.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
45. Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
46. I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
47. I expect to stay at this college for a bachelor's degree.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
48. I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
49. I worry a lot about my college expenses.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
50. I am enjoying my academic work at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
51. I have been feeling lonely a lot at college lately.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
52. I am having a lot of trouble getting started on homework assignments.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
53. I feel I have good control over my life situation at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
54. I am satisfied with my program of courses for this semester/quarter.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
55. I have been feeling in good health lately.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
56. I feel I am very different from other students at college in ways that I don't like.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
57. On balance, I would rather be home than here.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
58. Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my course work at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
59. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
60. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether and for good.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
61. I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from college and finishing later.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
62. I am very satisfied with the professors I have now in my courses.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
63. I have some good friends or acquaintances at college with whom I can talk about any problems I may have.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
64. I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
65. I am quite satisfied with my social life at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
66. I'm quite satisfied with my academic situation at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10
67. I feel confident that I will be able to deal in a satisfactory manner with future challenges here at college.	1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10

Appendix B: Athletic Satisfaction Questionnaire

(25)

Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire

This study is concerned with satisfaction of athletes. Athletics is an intense situation wherein individuals participate voluntarily and wholeheartedly. An individual may be satisfied to varying degrees with different types of experiences in athletic participation. In the following pages, several items related to athletic participation are listed. Against each item, a response format ranging from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 7 (extremely satisfied) is provided. You are requested to participate in the study and indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with the content of each item. Your honest and spontaneous response to each and every item is vital to the success of the study. Do not think about any one item for too long.

Example:

	Not at all Satisfied		Moderately Satisfied		Extremely Satisfied
I was satisfied with . . .					
the number of games we have won.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7

The respondent indicates that she is moderately satisfied with the number of games won.

For the purpose of this study, please recall your experiences during this particular season (or the one just completed), and record your reactions to those experiences.

It is extremely important that you provide a response to every question.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate and/or withdraw from participation at any time. You have the right to ask for the return of your responses. Please sign below to indicate your willingness to participate in this study. The anonymity of your responses is guaranteed. Thank you in advance for participating in this study.

Signature of Participant

Please proceed to the next page....

ASG Page 1

I am satisfied with....

	Not at all Satisfied		Moderately Satisfied			Extremely Satisfied	
1. how the team works (worked) to be the best.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. my social status on the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. the coach's choice of plays during competitions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. the competence of the medical personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. the degree to which I do (did) my best for the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. the degree to which I have reached (reached) my performance goals during the season.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. the degree to which my abilities are (were) used.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. the extent to which all team members are (were) ethical.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. the extent to which teammates provide (provided) me with instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. the funding provided to my team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. the media's support of our program.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. the recognition I receive (received) from my coach.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. the team's win/loss record this season.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. the training I receive (received) from the coach during the season.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. the tutoring I receive (received).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. my dedication during practices.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. my teammates' sense of fair play.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. the academic support services provided.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. the amount of money spent on my team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. the degree to which teammates share (shared) the same goal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please proceed to the next page....

<i>I am satisfied with....</i>	<div> <div>Not at all Satisfied</div> <div>Moderately Satisfied</div> <div>Extremely Satisfied</div> </div>						
21. the fairness with which the medical personnel treats all players	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. the friendliness of the coach towards me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. the guidance I receive (received) from my teammates.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. the improvement in my performance over the previous season.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. the instruction I have received from the coach this season.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. the level to which my talents are (were) employed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. the role I play (played) in the social life of the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. the support from the university community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. the tactics used during games.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. the team's overall performance this season.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. coach's choice of strategies during games	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. my enthusiasm during competitions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. my teammates' 'sportsmanlike' behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. team member's dedication to work together toward team goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. the coach's teaching of the tactics and techniques of my position.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. the constructive feedback I receive (received) from my teammates.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. the degree to which my teammates accept (accepted) me on a social level.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. the extent to which my role matches (matched) my potential.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please proceed to the next page....

ASG Page 3

<i>I am satisfied with....</i>	Not at all Satisfied		Moderately Satisfied		Extremely Satisfied	
39. the extent to which the team is meeting (has met) its goals for the season.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
40. the fulness of the team's budget.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
41. the improvement in my skill level.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
42. the level of appreciation my coach shows (showed) when I do (did) well.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
43. the medical personnel's interest in the athletes.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
44. the personnel of the academic support services (i.e., tutors, counselors).	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
45. the supportiveness of the fans.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
46. how the coach makes (made) adjustments during competitions.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
47. my coach's loyalty towards me.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
48. my commitment to the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
49. the amount of time I play (played) during competitions.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
50. the extent to which teammates play (played) as a team.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
51. the local community's support.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
52. the promptness of medical attention.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
53. coach's game plans.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
54. the degree to which my role on the team matches (matched) my preferred role.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
55. the extent to which the coach is (was) behind me.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
56. the manner in which coach combines (combined) the available talent.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7

**Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire!!! Please seal
it in the accompanying envelope and return it to your coach.**

ASE Page 4

Vita

Brian Russell was born in Indianapolis, Indiana and adopted by his parents, Paul and Rose Russell. He was the younger of two sons and attended LaVille High School in Lakeville, Indiana, and later, the University of Notre Dame, where he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in Sociology. After graduation, he attended The University of Tennessee and earned a Master of Science in Education with a major in College Student Personnel.

Following graduation, he began working professionally at The University of Tennessee as an Academic Advisor with the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences and later became an Assistant Director of Advising Services in the College of Arts and Sciences. Russell currently serves as the Director of Academic Services in the Thornton Athletics Student Life Center where he oversees day-to-day operations of academic support services for student-athletes.

He expects to receive his Ph.D. from The University of Tennessee in December 2015. He and his wife, Jenna, reside in Knoxville, Tennessee. They have a son, Benjamin Wilson Russell, born in May 2014.